DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 417 CE 030 853

AUTHOR	Brown, Linda Keller
TITLE	The Woman Manager in the United States. A Research Analysis and Bibliography.
INSTITUTION	Business and Professional Women's Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	89p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Business and Professional Women's Supply Service, Inc., 11722 Parklawn Dr., Rockville, MD 20852 ($5.50).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administration; Adults; Affirmative Action; Bibliographies; *Career Development; Career Education; *Females; Literature Reviews; *Management Development; *Managerial Occupations; *Sex Discrimination; *Social Influences; Stereotypes; Wages
IDENTIFIERS	Dual Career Family; Impact; United States

ABSTRACT

This review essay analyzes the present research on women as managers and executives in business, commerce, and industry in the United States. The nine sections of the essay cover the following topics of potential interest to researchers and businesswomen: the historical contributions of women to the development of management, the social forces contributing to change in the situation of female executives, the current status of women managers, the training and availability of women for managerial positions, stereotypes of manager characteristics and the resulting differential treatment of female managers, the effects of affirmative action, career development and career strategies, the profile of the successful woman executive, and the social and business impact of dual-career lifestyles. Each section presents and critiques current knowledge on the topic, explores areas of controversy, and suggests aspects needing more research or fresh insights. All citations in the footnotes are listed in abbreviated form in the Notes following each section. A bibliography contains complete citations. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218417

The Woman Manager in the United States

A Research Analysis and Bibliography

Linda Keller Brown
Center for the Social Sciences
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

CE 030 853

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Katherin Dickson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Business and Professional Women's Foundation
2012 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. Linda Keller Brown is Director of the Cross-National Project on Women as Corporate Managers at the Center for the Social Sciences at Columbia University in New York City. This Project is an analysis of the economic and social factors affecting the leadership of women in business in the United States, England, Sweden, Italy, West Germany, Japan, Thailand, and the Philippines. Funding has been provided by the German Marshall Fund, the Social Science Research Council, and the Ford Foundation.

Prior to coming to Columbia University, Dr. Brown was the Resident Scholar for the International Communication Agency and a consultant and lecturer for the U.S. Department of State, the United States Information Agency, and the Fulbright Commission of Japan. She has also taught at Rutgers University and the City University of New York.

Copyright © 1981 by Linda Keller Brown. All rights reserved.
Business & Professional Women's Foundation.

Table of Contents

Section		Page
	Introduction	1
I.	An Historical Perspective on the Woman Manager in the United States	3
II.	Overview of Forces for Change: Demographic, Educational, Legal and Social	9
III.	The Current Status of Woman Managers	13
	Statistical Overview	13
	Women Managers and Corporate Boards: Attempts to Achieve More Status in American Corporate Life	15
IV.	Interest in Executive Careers and Entry into Business: Career Choice and Availability of Women for Managerial Positions	19
V.	Stereotypes of Manager Characteristics	27
	Occupational Sex Typing and the Image of the Executive	27
	Male Managers, Female Managers, and the Androgynous Model. Making Manager a Neuter Term	30
VI.	The Behavioral Consequences of Stereotypes: Discrimination	37
	Differential Treatment of Women Managers	37
	Opportunities for Women Managers: Has Affirmative Action Made Any Difference?	41
VII.	Career Development of Women Managers	51
	Advice Books for Aspiring Women Executives	51
	Mentors and Networks: New Strategies or New Rationalizations?	56
VIII.	Profile of the Successul Woman Executive. Comparison of Male and Female Managers: "A Significant Case of No Significant Difference"?	63

Section Page

IX. Lifestyles of Contemporary Female Managers: The Dual-Career Couple 73

Research Note 78

Bibliography 79

TABLES

Table Page

I. Female Managers, 1900-1979 13

II. Detailed Occupational Categories Within Census Classification, "Managers and Administrators, Except Farm" 14

III. Composition of Corporate Boards of Directors: Percentage Having Any Women Directors: Percentage Having Any Ethnic Minority Directors 16

IV. Percentage of Companies with Women Directors 16

V. Career Goals of Freshman Woman, 1969 and 1979 21

VI. Percentage of Degrees in Business and Management Received by Women 22

VII. Representation Within Industry Groups: Percentage of all Managers who are Female 64

For: A. Hilda Keller
Strength, courage, vision.

Introduction

From the female entrepreneur in the eighteenth century who managed the first printing of a signed copy of the Declaration of Independence to Lillian Gilbreth in the twentieth century who helped establish the field of modern mangerial psychology, the American woman has had a significant, but largely unrecognized role in the development of American business. However, in recent years, a convergence of legal, educational, demographic, and social developments have begun to move women into visible positions in the mainstream of corporate management. This review essay analyzes the present state of research on women as managers and executives in business, commerce, and industry in the United States. Material on this subject is divided among a range of fields and subspecialties: industrial psychology, business administration, human resource development, industrial education, sociology, communications, management, and organizational psychology. Recently, there has been a rapid increase in research, more integrative work, and the emergence of a major body of literature on women as manager.[1]

The sections of this essay cover the following topics of potential interests to researchers and to businesswomen: the historical contributions of women to the development of management, the social forces contributing to change in the situation of female executives, the current status of women managers, the training and availability of women for managerial positions, stereotypes of manager characteristics and the resulting differential treatment of female managers, the effects of affirmative action, career development and career strategies, the profile of the successful woman executive, and the social and business impact of dual-career lifestyles. Each section presents and critiques current knowledge on the topic, explores areas of controversy, and suggests aspects needing more research or fresh insights.

I am grateful to Catherine Selden and Terry Odendahl of the Business and Professional Women's Foundation for assistance in obtaining materials and funding for this project. I also appreciate the efforts of Mariam Chamberlain of the Ford Foundation, Christina Graf of the German Marshall Fund, and Ronald Wells of the Connecticut Humanities Council; they have been strong supporters of my research on women managers.

I wish to thank and to acknowledge the contributions of typist Helen Danner and research assistants Cihan Sultanoglu, Martha Ecker, and Eolin Tweedie.

An early version of some sections of this book appeared in L.K. Brown, "Women and Business Management," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5, no. 2 (Winter 1979): 266-68. Used with permission of The University of Chicago Press. © 1979 by the University of Chicago.

All citations in the footnotes, including first references, are listed in abbreviated form in the Notes following each Section. See the bibliography

for the complete citation. General material that has been used as background comment and which does not contain information specifically on women managers is cited in full in the note and is not included in the bibliography.

NOTES

[1]None of the extensive research on women in authority and women as managers in non-business fields, especially the human services area, is included here. The major bibliographic listings for earlier material on women in business management are: Business and Professional Women's Foundation, *Women Executives;* U.S. Department of Labor, *Women in Management;* Haist, *Women in Management;* Williams et al., *Women in Management;* Swanick, *Women as Administrators.*

SECTION I

An Historical Perspective on the Woman Manager in the United States

When the full history of American business is written, the early and important contributions made by women will finally be revealed. Few know, for example, of the intrepid Margaret LaForge, who became the first lady boss of a large commercial operation, Macy's Department Store, in the mid-nineteenth century when women were not expected to take an interest in economic enterprise.[1] The history of women in business, especially as managers and entrepreneurs, has remained hidden for several reasons. Standard primary sources on American business history have tended to exclude women from their pages or to define the achievements of women in other than economic terms. Interpretations of history have too often accepted the stereotypical notion that women were in the home and not actively engaged in business; and until recently, women did not collectively assert the importance of their own history. That situation is in flux, however, and a renewed interest in women has led to books and articles which have relied on little-known sources in order to indicate the extent and importance of women's participation in the economic sphere of American society. For example, Caroline Bird's *Enterprising Women* seeks to remedy past neglect by profiling women who have made important contributions to American business, "women who initiated concepts that created new kinds of work or affected the rules of the economic game."[2]

Contemporary businesswomen may only now be recovering the influence of their colonial counterparts. Miriam Schneir's work identifies the early economic role of the "she merchants" of seventeenth century New York. This group included such women as Maria van Cortlandt, who owned and managed a Hudson Valley patroonship of three-quarters of a million acres, and Margaret Hardenbrook who operated a fleet of merchant ships engaged in international commerce.[3] Information gathered from advertisements in colonial newspapers, customs reports, and other sources indicates that by the early eighteenth century, women played an important and commonly accepted role in the colonies as merchants, who were considered part of the upper classes of that period. Most women merchants were widows who inherited their businesses after the death of a spouse, but there were a number of single women who, without the disdain of the society in which they lived and worked, successfully undertook to manage large businesses. Merchants were distinguished from shopkeepers (who were considered part of the middle-class and contained an even larger percentage of women) in that they imported and exported goods as well as wholesaling and retailing them.[4]

Female merchants were active in many colonial cities. In pre-Revolutionary Boston, for example, Elizabeth Dexter has estimated that 9.5 percent of the traders — that is, merchants and shopkeepers — were women.[5] In colonial New York City, approximately 2 percent of the merchants were women, a percentage equal to that of women holding top-level management positions in the United States in the 1970s. Historian Jean Jordan comments on this comparison:

> To put [these figures] in perspective, it must be remembered that merchants were at the summit of the colonial economy. In today's vastly larger and more complex economy, positions of comparable power and prestige would be those of president or chairman of the board of major business corporations . . . Women apparently are only now winning the proportion of high level economic positions they had in the colonial period.[6]

After the Revolution, economic opportunities for women narrowed. The ideology of "true womanhood" emerged in the early nineteenth century and maintained that women should remain apart from the corrupting influences of politics and business.[7] Middle- and upper-class women tended to remain at home following this social norm, while poor and working class women were forced by economic necessity to take menial and factory jobs. Some women, however, continued to pursue their careers despite the change in the social climate. Women continued, although in lesser numbers, to be shopkeepers and merchants. Immigrant women, often unmarried, were forced to work in order to support themselves; many developed their entrepreneurial talents, sometimes beginning as peddlers and then expanding their business by renting shops to sell their wares. For example, Irene Neu has documented the role of Jewish immigrant women as "economic energizers" who succeeded in establishing their own workshops or small factories "for which their husbands may well have received the credit."[8]

The beginning of the twentieth century saw women pursuing legal change and economic independence. Describing this period, Frank Stricker states:

> Along with the demand for political equality, the desire for a career was a central theme in early twentieth-century feminism. Although a career was not a real possibility for the majority of women, and although the career impulse was not identical with feminism, it did express the driving impulse of many advanced middle-class women.[9]

Even among young women, there remained a relatively high level of careerism. A survey conducted in 1924 with women aged 15 to 17 revealed that more than one-third said they would choose a career even if that necessitated giving up the possibility of marriage and a family.[10] It was during this time period that Lillian Gilbreth (1878-1972) made substantial con-

tributions to the new era of scientific management. She co-authored *Primer of Scientific Management,* although only her husband's name appears on the work since the publisher did not want a woman listed as collaborator. With her husband, Frank, she began the field of motion study, which combined management and mechanical engineering. (Her theories in this area may have benefitted from her experience as a mother of twelve children!) Gilbreth recognized early that the key to managerial success is the individual and his feelings. This theme was central to her work, which established her as one of the leading figures in managerial psychology.[11]

Analyzing the late 1920s and the decade of the 1930s, many historians have contended that professional women became disillusioned with the ideals of economic independence and exciting work and returned to the home. But recent evidence counters this theory of disillusionment, which is based primarily on literary evidence rather than statistical facts. By refining the Census data on women's share of professional and business occupations, Frank Stricker shows that after 1920, there was a slight but real increase in the *number* of women "managers, officials, and proprietors." While college-educated women did, in fact, indicate an increasing preference for mariage and a family, a substantial percentage of these women also desired the pursuit of a career.[12]

The middle and later part of the twentieth century also witnessed other important contributions by women to management and organizational theory. Mary Parker Follett (1868-1933), a political scientist, sought to integrate social science and business administration. Many of her innovative ideas were decades ahead of their time and foreshadowed today's approaches to management science, particularly in the areas of systems analysis and conflict resolution.[13] In the current era of behavioral management science, another key female figure is Jane Mouton, co-author or *The Managerial Grid,* which presents an instrument for identifying and changing leadership style.[14]

Some knowledge of women's contribution to business enterprise in the United States as well as a familiarity with the history of women in general is invaluable for both men and women who are working to change and improve the status of women both on the job and in other arenas of life. Past mistakes provide valuable lessons of events and ideas which should not be repeated. Had women in the period immediately following World War II had some acquaintance with their own history and a collective consciousness about their situation in society, they might have been quicker to understand that the economic gains they had achieved were a result of demographic and socioeconomic factors not directly related to the war.[15] More importantly, they might have shown more hesitation about giving up those gains by translating them into social structural changes. Historian Frank Stricker writes:

> What was missing all through these years was not a base of discontents or significant numbers of career women, but a feminist

movement to interpret these discontents as collective phenomena, rooted in fundamentally inegalitarian social and economic structures.[16]

Recent historical research has shown that women have consistently been able to make important contributions to economic enterprise even in those periods of American history when they did not have the political or legal rights they have and continue to fight for today. That so little has been known of women's historical contributions to business enterprise indicates that a certain amount of discrimination continues to exist among both the academic community and society at large. More historical research and an historical perspective on the part of today's businesswomen could strengthen current movements for equal opportunity by giving a sense of continuity to the struggle and by providing a basis for solidarity and pride. A knowledge of history underscores the paramount importance of women continuing to make inroads in business and economic life. As Susan King, who in 1872 went to Asia to set up the Women's Tea Company, claimed: "The dollar is a language people understand all over the world . . . But now mark my words, if ever women do get the right of suffrage it will be through their showing the ability to win the dollar, and win it just as men do."[17]

NOTES

[1]For details on LaForge, see Johnson, *America's First Lady Boss.*

[2]Bird, *Enterprising Women.* This book was a Bicentennial project of the Business and Professional Women's Foundation.

[3]Schneir, *'She Merchants' in Seventeenth Century Holland and New Netherland.*

[4]Jordan, "Women Merchants."

[5]Dexter, *Colonial Women of Affairs.*

[6]Jordan, "Women Merchants," pp. 436-37.

[7]Jordan, "Women Merchants," p. 438. See also Dexter, *Career Women of America,* pp. 139-62.

[8]Neu, "The Jewish Businesswoman in America."

[9]Stricker, "Cookbooks and Lawbooks," p. 1.

[10]Stricker, "Cookbooks and Lawbooks, p. 3.

[11]For details, see Greenwood, "Lillian M. Gilbreth" and Stead, "Women's Contributions."

[12]Stricker, "Cookbooks and Lawbooks," pp. 2-5. For an analysis of the effect of the Depression on women's white-collar and professional work, see Scharf, *To Work and To Wed.*

[13]For an example of Follett's work, see *Dynamic Administration, The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett,* new ed. by E.M. Fox and L. Urwick (London: Pitman, 1973). Originally published (New York: Harper, 1942).

[6]Stead, "Women's Contributions," pp. 265-67; J.S. Mouton and R.R. Blake, *The Managerial Grid* (Houston: Gulf Pub., 1964).

[7]Hartmann, "Prescriptions for Penelope"; Oppenheimer, *The Female Labor Force*. Also see Anderson, *Wartime Women*.

[8]Stricker, "Cookbooks and Lawbooks," p. 11.

[9]Quoted in Bird, *Enterprising Women*, p. 86.

SECTION II

Overview of Forces for Change: Demographic, Educational, Legal, and Social

The pressures underlying the current changes in the situation of women managers are coming from a variety of factors: demographic, educational, legal, and social. These forces are combining to alter women's attitudes and expectations regarding their future roles in the work world. Some aspects of these developments which particularly affect women managers are discussed in later Sections. However, it is important to have an overview of the *interaction* of these forces for change, because they provide the context in which today's female executive operates.

The demographic profile of contemporary women shows substantial work-inducing changes in family lifestyles. Traditionally, women stayed at home during the years when their children were young. This withdrawal from paid employment during childbearing has been crucial to women workers' career development because this absence occurs during those years in which job advancement tends to be most rapid. Today, women are living longer, having fewer children, and having them later in life — often after they have made significant headway in their own careers. With greater frequency, they are continuing to work while their children are still at home. Changing concepts of the role of women have led, as well, to childless marriages, postponement of marriage, or the decision not to marry at all. The greater frequency with which women are getting divorced and heading households has made working an economic necessity, not an interesting option. The current economic situation in the United States has also increased in the likelihood that women with working husbands in the household will also enter the job market at some point during their adult lives. Section III discusses the impact of this larger female labor force and its relationship to the proportion of women working in management positions.

Educational changes are also contributing to different expectations and work opportunities for women. In an excellent discussion of the factors affecting the kinds of jobs women hold, Kenneth Lawrence, in *Sex Discrimination in the Workplace,* explains:

> In the past, the relatively small proportion of women continuing through college and graduate training was predictable, given the existence of social mores that downgraded feminine education and the lack of suitable job opportunities for educated women. Perception of this lower likely return on investment in human capital discouraged investments in higher education by women

and thereby helped to create a chain of factors which maintained the stereotyped occupational distribution of women workers.[1]

The educational attainment of women has been steadily rising. The Census recently reported that between 1970 and 1978, the number of women 16 to 34 years old enrolled in college grew 57 percent, compared with a 16 percent growth for men. Women's enrollment in graduate programs doubled in that period.[2] Significantly, many of these women are also choosing different fields of study than in the past. Section IV details the rapid gains in the enrollment of women in business and managerial courses.

Women's expanded role in the work force has been accompanied by legal changes to enhance equal opportunity in the labor market. The legal framework created by recent legislation, executive action, and judicial decisions had been directed toward ending discrimination resulting from employer behavior. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 compels employers to compensate men and women in the same establishment equally for work of equivalent effort performed under similar working conditions. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits sexual discrimination in employment. This legislation and its applications are summarized in the Department of Labor publication, *A Working Woman's Guide to Her Job Rights.*[3]

While the laws of the 1960s established the necessary legal groundwork, it was not until the early 1970s that three important developments — a Supreme Court decision, an administrative order, and a consent decree — made U.S. corporations keenly aware of their nondiscrimination obligations to women. In 1971, the U.S. Supreme Court (in Griggs v. Duke Power Co.) endorsed a results-oriented definition of what constitutes employment discrimination. The employer's intent is not the measure; the *consequences* of an employer's actions determine whether discrimination has taken place. Also in 1971, the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance issued an administrative order requiring government contractors to have a written affirmative action plan including goals and timetables to correct any areas in which the contractor is deficient in providing equal opportunity for women employees. In 1973, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company signed a consent agreement with the Department of Labor and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The company agreed to undertake many affirmative action steps to ensure that equal employment opportunities were provided for women and minorities. Similar cases involving millions of dollars have been settled against General Electric, Northwest Airlines, Uniroyal, and Merrill Lynch. These developments under the federal nondiscrimination laws are explained fully in two publications by Ruth Gilbert Shaeffer for the Conference Board: *Non-discrimination in Employment, Changing Perspectives, 1963-1972* and *Non-discrimination in Employment, 1973-1975, A Broadening and Deepening National Effort.*[4] Section VI-B discusses recent research findings on the effect of affirmative action specifically on the situation of women managers.

While there have been substantial gains in the legal bases for equal employment opportunity for women, the success of any legislation in this area requires widespread *social* support for the goals. As Simone Veil, the first woman president of the European Common Market, states, "Legislated equality must broaden to become mental equality."[5]

Significant shifts in social attitudes which support women in career positions are reflected in the data gathered in the American Women's Opinion Poll. These surveys conducted since 1970 by the Roper Organization have measured changes in the attitudes of women and men on a variety of issues.[6] At the beginning of the decade, a minority of women (40 percent) approved of most of the efforts to strengthen and change women's status in society. Today, women and men favor a change in women's status in equal numbers (64 percent). In 1980, women are more likely to be working and to be career-oriented. Of the working women interviewed in 1980, 45 percent planned to make their jobs full-time careers, compared to 39 percent in 1970.

The Roper Polls also observed that as women have become more career-oriented, they have become more conscious of sexual discrimination in the workplace. In 1980 women are more aware of the difficulties of obtaining leadership positions in business. A significant number of full-time working women (65 percent) perceive discrimination against women when they attempt to obtain executive positions in business. Nearly half (48 percent) of the men also think women will encounter discrimination in seeking such a job.

However, one of the most interesting changes in work-related attitudes is in the image of the "boss." In the Roper survey, two-thirds of all working women — and men — claim that it makes no difference to them whether they have a male or female boss. Among working women, this figure represents an improvement from 1970, when only slightly more than half of this group stated it made no difference to them. Such a change indicates that more favorable image working women have of themselves and of other women, and negates many of the prejudices (e.g., women will not work for women) which have limited women's advancement in managerial positions.

These changing social attitudes interact with the demographic, educational, and legal factors to create a climate favorable for the hiring of larger numbers of women in entry-level positions in management. Executive recruiters estimate that a manager requires 15 to 25 years to become a top executive. The presence, however small, of women in the chief executive suite today is actually surprising, since these women would have had to achieve much of their progress up through the ranks during the 1950s, a period of extreme emphasis on women's domestic functions. Even fifteen years ago, in the mid 1960s, only 1 percent of entering managerial trainees were female. The extent of the change is evident in the current entry figures, with women comprising 15 percent of the beginning managers.[7] Similarly, the occupational distribution of young women workers (ages 20-34) shows

an encouraging trend with a greater percentage now working in "professional, technical, and managerial" occupations (24.5 percent in 1977 compared with 20 percent in 1968).[8]

While the greater visibility of corporate women may not yet reflect real (i.e., statistical) gain, commentators believe it is reinforcing women's aspirations to achieve success in a previously male field.[9] The immediate and long-term effects of this new situation are difficult to predict, but more than one investigator has argued that the so-called "problems" of women in management would disappear if there were simply more of them.[10]

NOTES

[1]Lawrence, *Sex Discrimination in the Workplace*, p. 351.

[2]U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *A Statistical Portrait of Women*, Tables 5-1, 5-2.

[3]U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, *A Working Woman's Guide*.

[4]Shaeffer, *Non-discrimination in Employment, Changing Perspectives, 1963-1972*, and *Non-discrimination in Employment, 1973-1975, A Broadening and Deepening National Effort*.

[5]Simone Veil interview, "My Side," *Working Woman*, July 1980.

[6]Roper Organization, *The 1980 Virginia Slims American Women's Opinion Poll*.

[7]"Up the Ladder, Finally."

[8]Unpublished tabulations of U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, reported in Smith, *The Subtle Revolution*, p. 52.

[9]E.g., Badawy, "How Women Managers View Their Role."

[10]See Epstein, "Institutional Barriers" and Kanter, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Chapter 8.

SECTION III

The Current Status of Women Managers

Statistical Overview

At first glance, the gains in the number of women managers in the United States over the last three decades appear significant and promising. Women now constitute 24.6 percent of all "managers and administrators," an increase from about 14 percent in 1947. In the short period from 1972 to 1979 alone, the number of women in this category increased by 75 percent — from 17.5 percent to 24.6 percent of all "managers and administrators."[1] This would seem to indicate an ongoing pattern of continuing, albeit slow, progress. As the following table shows, in terms of simple overall statistics, there has been a gradual growth over this past century in women's share of business occupations.

TABLE I

Female Managers, 1900-1979[2]

Year	Number of Female Managers, Officials, and Proprietors (except farm)	Female Percentage of Total Managers, Officials, Proprietors
1900	74,374	4.4%
1910	150,067	6.1%
1920	190,627	6.8%
1930	292,274	8.1%
1940	414,472	11.0%
1950	699,807	13.6%
1960	1,099,000	15.6%
1970	1,320,000	16.0%
1979	2,587,000	24.6%

But to be evaluated fairly, these statistics must be analyzed in relation to two other measures: (1) the labor force participation of women, and (2) the breakdown of specific occupational categories included within the Census designation "managers and administrators." This first development, the growth in the number of wage-earning women, has been one of the most striking phenomena of modern American society. The Urban Institute describes the change as a "subtle revolution" affecting "virtually all of our social and economic arrangements."[3] Between 1890 and 1978,

overall annual female labor force participation increased from 18 percent to 50 percent, while that of males declined from 84 percent to 78 percent. The sharpest sustained increases in the participation rates of women have occurred in recent decades — from 32 percent in 1947 to 43 percent in 1970 to 51 percent in 1980.[4]

However, while more women work outside the home, the vast majority still do "women's work." The most serious problem facing women in the labor market today is their over concentration in a narrow range of jobs and industries. Sixty percent of all female workers are employed in clerical work, health care (excluding physicians), education, food service, and domestic service.[5] This occupational segregation is especially pertinent to the situation of women managers. *The growth in the number of female managers has not been proportional to the overall influx of women into the work force.* The percentage of employed women who work in managerial/administrative positions has remained relatively constant, from 5 percent in 1947 to only 6 percent in 1978. This compares to 15 percent of the male labor force now holding managerial jobs.[6]

Furthermore, even this statistic of relative stability in the proportion of women workers who become managers/administrators does not reveal the concentration of women in a limited range of job titles within management. Table II details the occupational categories included in the Census classification of "managers and administrators."

TABLE II

Detailed Occupational Categories Within Census Classification "Managers and Administrators, Except Farm" (1979)[7]

	Percentage of Total in Category who are Female
Managers and Administrators, except Farm	24.6
Bank Officials and Financial Managers	31.6
Buyers and Purchasing Agents	30.4
Buyers, Wholesale and Retail Trade	40.0
Credit and Collection Managers	40.0
Health Administrators	48.1
Inspectors, Except Construction and Public Administration	12.5
Managers and Superintendents, Building	50.0
Office Managers, not elsewhere classified	63.0
Officials and Administrators; Public Administration not elsewhere classified	26.6
Officials of Lodges, Societies and Unions	29.2
Restaurant, Cafeteria and Bar Managers	35.4

Sales Managers and Department Heads, Retail Trade	39.8
Sales Managers, Except Retail Trade	8.6
School Administrators, College	32.8
School Administrators, Elementary and Secondary	37.5
All Other Managers and Administrators	17.7

As can be seen in Table II, most women managers are in the fields of health administration; general office management; building management; restaurant, cafeteria and bar managers; and sales managers and department heads in retail trade.

Within the business/industrial complex, the situation of the female manager is at once discouraging and promising. Women total only about 5 percent of middle management and barely 1 percent of top management. In the highest-ranking executive jobs in the country, women are almost nonexistent. A recent *Fortune* survey of the 1,300 largest companies in America found only 10 women among the 6,400 corporate officers.[8] The disparity between female and male executives is especially evident when salary is the determinant of position. U.S. Census statistics on total money income show that only 102,000 female managers and administrators earn over $25,000, as compared to 2,560,000 males.[9]

Women Managers and Corporate Boards: Attempts to Achieve More Status in American Corporate Life

Both the gains and the restrictions on women's achievements in management are paralleled and reflected in the situation of female members of boards of directors of U.S. corporations. Organized efforts to increase the number of female directors first began in the early 1950s when the Federation of Women Shareholders drafted a proposed resolution concerning women directors. Ironically, the SEC rendered the motion inadmissable by claiming that it furthered a cause (an issue of race, creed, or sex). Prior to 1970, the small number of females in the corporate boardrooms was usually wives or female relatives of corporate founders or executives.[10] But a decade later one out of every four boards now has a female member. The Korn/Ferry annual studies of boards of directors record this change in the number of women directors (Table III).

TABLE III

Composition of Corporate Boards of Directors[11]

Year	Percentage of Boards Having Any Women Directors	Percentage of Boards Having Any Ethnic Minority Directors
1973	10.7	8.9
1974	11.4	10.7
1975	19.5	15.1
1976	21.3	13.6
1977	24.4	13.6
1978	28.0	15.1
1979	36.4	19.2

(Data on minorities included here for purposes of comparison.)

In explaining the reasons for this change, J.E. Stultz identifies several influences that, more broadly, are affecting the whole environment of women in business: the corporation's growing "response to the public's demand for social responsibility and accountability"; the trend toward "outside" or "independent" directors; the awareness that previous criteria for choosing directors are no longer acceptable; corporate realization that "it is in their own interest to have women on the board."[12] On this latter point, in an article profiling one hundred top corporate women, *Business Week* reported that male executives recruit these women to serve on boards not as "a response to the 'consciousness-raising' of the past decade, but as a calculated move to get counsel on developing their own women executives."[13]

Interestingly, larger corporations have been the most active in seeking women directors. As can be seen in Table IV, below, female representation in the boardroom is most likely in the largest and the smallest corporations.

TABLE IV

Percentage of Companies with Women Directors[14]

Under $5 million	41%
$5-$25 million	17%
$25-$50 million	21%
$50-$100 million	5%
$100-$500 million	11%
Over $500 million	27%
Banks	26%

Since the most desirable board candidate is a chief executive officer or a senior executive of another company, female board representation is linked to the availability of senior female executives.[15] At first, corporate attention focused on a limited number of prominent female business leaders — whom Stultz terms a "constellation of superstars." With increasing numbers of women managers expected to attain higher positions, there is a greater opportunity to broaden the base for selection. Two organizations in New York City — Catalyst and the Financial Women's Association — are attempting to promote women for these high corporate posts by maintaining name resource files and providing qualified candidates to corporations seeking directors.[16]

However, while there have been advances in the number of companies selecting female board members, the situation may be analogous to that of women managers — another instance where publicity still exceeds real gains. Most corporate boards that have women directors have only one or two, and some prominent women serve on more than one board. Consequently, in these influential positions in the corporate boardroom, there are actually only between three and four hundred women, compared with an estimated 15,000 men.[17] *Business and Society Review* prefaced its extensive listing of corporations and their female board members with this assessment:

> What began as a trickle in 1972 now has become a flood . . . it appears that the stereotype, the all-white, all male board of directors is breaking down. Does this mean that women . . . are starting to acquire a real power in the business world? . . . We think not. One reason is that relative to their overall numbers . . . women remain horribly underrepresented on corporate boards. . . . [Moreover,] women directors serve at the discretion of top management, which remains all-white and virtually all-male.[18]

NOTES

[1]For statistics on women in management, see U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *A Statistical Portrait of Women*, Chapter 8; U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, "Table: Women are Underrepresented as Managers . . ."; Business and Professional Women's Foundation, *Women in Management*, pp. 3-4; Baron, "Selection, Development and Socialization of Women into Management"; "An Overview of Women in the Workforce"; and U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employment and Earnings* 27, no. 1 (January 1980): 174.

[2]Table I sources: (All percentages calculated by author) Kaplan and Casey, *Occupational Trends in the United States, 1900-1950*, pp. 6-7; U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employment and Earnings* 7, no. 7 (January 1961): xv; U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employment and Earnings* 17, no. 7 (January 1971): 126; U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employment and Earnings* 27, no. 1 (January 1980): 174. Figures for 1979 are under a slightly different heading, "Managers and administrators, except farm."

[3]Smith, *The Subtle Revolution*, pp. ix, 1. This important book presents the implications of the continued movement of women into the labor force and the present and future effects

on the job market, marriage, children, living standards, and public institutions such as the tax and social security systems.

[5]Smith, *Subtle Revolution*, pp. 3-4; U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *A Statistical Portrait of Women, pp. 41-42; U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment in Perspective: Working Women.*

[6]Smith, *Subtle Revolution*, p. 10.

[7]Same sources as in Footnote 1, above, in this section.

[8]U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employment and Earnings* 27, no. 1, (January 1980): 174.

[9]W. Robertson, "The Top Women in Big Business": "Up the Ladder, Finally": Business and Professional Women's Foundation, *Women in Management*, p. 4; Frank, *Women in the Organization*, pp. 164-65.

[10]U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Money Income of Families and Persons in the United States: 1978*, pp. 244-46.

[11]Stultz, "Madam Director," p. 8.

[12]Korn/Ferry International, *Board of Directors Annual Study (First-Seventh).*

[13]Stultz, "Madam Director," pp. 8-9.

[14]"100 Top Corporate Women," pp. 56-57.

[15]Stultz, "Madam Director," p. 9.

[16]Booz, Allen and Hamilton, "Corporate Board Trends with Respect to Directors — Particularly Women."

[17]I. Barmash, "Women Recommended as Potential Directors;" "Executive Suite: Finding Directorships for Women"; Klemesrud, "Women Executives: View from the Top," p. 50. See also "Women Directors: How to Get on a Corporate Board."

[18]Much, "Managing the Board," p. 57.

[19]"Out of the Typing Pool and Onto the Board," pp. 27-28.

Interest in Executive Careers and Entry into Business: Career Choice and Availability of Women for Managerial Positions

The U.S. Department of Labor predicts that the number of managerial and administrative jobs will increase more rapidly in the next few years than in the past decade of the 1960s. Eight million such jobs existed in the early 1970s; and increase to ten and a half million is predicted by 1985.[1] At the same time that jobs may be increasing, analysts have warned that the usual pool of talent for managerial positions may be decreasing. Already in the 1960s, writers predicted major shortages of executive talent because of the low birthrate of the 1930s and the demand for managerial talent outside industry.[2] More recently, John Miner has predicted both a decline in the number of qualified male candidates and a decline in the male's "motivation to manage." By the early 1980s, Miner declares, the shortage of managerial resources will result in corporations recruiting from relatively unutilized sources of managerial talent, the largest of which is the female population.[3]

Traditionally, women have been reluctant to prepare for business careers. Research and theory on career choice emphasizes the importance of an individual's self-concept in determining vocational preference. People choose careers that are consistent with their self-image. Since, as the next Section in this essay details, the dominant managerial model is male, women who accept the stereotypic female role are less inclined to acquire the training or job behaviors associated with managers because such characteristics are inconsistent with their self-image. This situation further perpetuates the stereotype and becomes self-reinforcing by keeping women out of role-model positions which could encourage more women to aspire to managerial careers. The effects of stereotypes in limiting the occupational choices of women, the bias of counselors in discouraging women from choosing non-traditional careers, the absence of female role models for would-be managers, and the apprehensions of female students and their reluctance to consider managerial careers are all well-documented subjects and constitute standard research in this field. A good overview and critique of these findings is provided in separate analyses by J.S. Crawford and Jeanne J. Speizer.[4]

These patterns of early social learning and the resulting restrictive attitudes toward career choice continue to persist among young people.[5] It is difficult to measure accurately the values of individuals and to predict how their stated beliefs will or will not be translated into behavior. However, a recent survey of 5,000 young women aged 21 to 31 indicated that of those

who expected to be in the labor force at age 35, the overwhelming majority aspired to traditionally female occupations. Among college females, for example, 75 percent of the whites and 78 percent of the blacks said they would prefer to be in a typically female job.[6] As Nancy Barrett points out:

> . . . although the struggle for equal rights and the egalitarian ideology accompanying it have produced a philosophical environment that encourages women to seek new opportunities, many still opt for traditionally female labor market activities even as they reject the role of full-time homemaker.[7]

However, there exists other evidence to indicate that in the 1970s a major change occurred in women's attitudes and in their career behavior. In 1979, the American Council on Education (ACE) sponsored a survey of nearly 200,000 college freshmen and compared their responses with those of their counterparts ten years earlier.[8] Dramatic changes in student attitudes are apparent in this national profile. Women have become more materialistic and ambitious. Goals identified as "very important or essential" by freshmen in 1979, compared with 1969, showed these changes:

- Being well off financially was selected by 28 percent more men, but by 77 percent more women.
- Raising a family was cited by 17 percent fewer women and 2 percent fewer men.
- Having administrative responsibility was considered significant by more than one-third of the women in 1979, as compared to less than one-sixth of the females in 1969.
- While the percentages of men interested in succeeding in their own business remained nearly the same over the decade, 28 percent more women identified this as an objective (55 percent of all male students vs. 42 percent of all female students).

Moreover, the ACE survey reveals that these increasingly materialistic goals of students have been accompanied by changes in their career plans. In the 1979 freshmen class, 15 percent of the women and 18 percent of the men plan careers in business, as compared with 4 percent of the women and 17 percent of the men a decade ago. The shift in the career goals of freshmen women is strikingly evident in the figures in Table V.

This increase in women's interest in business careers has resulted in unprecendented gains in female enrollment in business and managerial courses. This rapid growth challenges many of the prevailing assumptions of researchers. A study of enrollment patterns in the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) reveals that the 61 percent increase in total MBA enrollment from 1972 to 1977 was largely caused by a 338 percent female enrollment increase.[9] Table VI records women's increasing share of the degrees awarded in business and management. Although the female proportion of advanced degrees is still quite small, the increase in a short time period is noteworthy.

TABLE V

Career Goals of Freshmen Women
1969 and 1979

Sources: Chart by Peter H. Stafford, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (January 28, 1980), p. 3. Based on *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1979.* Reprinted with permission by *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Copyright 1980 by The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inc.

Ten years ago, few women attended graduate business schools (Harvard did not even admit women into its two-year program until 1963); now women comprise 20 percent of MBA enrollments.[11] The AACSB survey also shows that the increase in female graduate business students has been paralleled by dramatic increases in the number of *undergraduate* females seeking specialized, business-oriented training. In collegiate schools of business, the largest female enrollments are in accounting, general business, marketing and quantitative methods (e.g., data processing).[12] This female selection of fields is crucial, since theorists have argued that female specialists, such as actuaries and systems analysts, are in prime positions to develop access to higher management.[13]

Since attitudes change slowly, it is difficult to assess the cultural implications of this significant trend. The increased interest of women in

TABLE VI

Percentage of Degrees in Business and Management Received by Women[10]

	1969-70	1976-77
B.A. Degrees	8.7	23.4
M.A. Degrees	3.5	14.3
Ph.D. Degrees	1.7	6.3

managerial careers does not necessarily invalidate the existing research on occupational choices, early socialization, stereotypes, and role models, but it does suggest the need for caution in the use of research findings more than three or four years old. Current research is seriously needed on these new business students. Where did these women locate role models or does this generation of women no longer need them? With the overcrowding of other professions such as law and teaching, what has been the influence of the economy in reshaping women's occupational aspirations? Have the attitudes of potential male managers been affected by the increased presence of women as classmates? Investigators have barely begun to modify their research questions to analyze this new pattern.[14]

For example, in the past many commentators have claimed that the disinterest of women in earning the appropriate college degrees has caused the lack of growth in the number of women in managerial and technical vocations.[15] However, as can be seen in Table VI, the percentage of business degrees awarded to women has grown substantially. Studies have confirmed that the MBA degree has a positive effect on *access* for women at the time of job entry, especially for women who have undergraduate degrees in the humanities.[16]

However, while specialized training may heighten women's expectations and facilitate their entry into managerial jobs, the central issue for aspiring women managers is whether, in fact, having the right educational credentials will open the doors into the executive suite. Do women with the same professional credentials as men really have equal employment prospects after graduation? Studies of earlier manager groups would suggest that women's careers are affected by other structural variables.

In a retrospective survey of the progress of 6,400 MBAs from a 25-year period beginning in 1947, Steele and Ward also found that if beginning salaries reflect opportunities in any way, even females with the credential of an MBA have always had less opportunity for management careers than their male counterparts. In 1947, the median starting salary for women MBAs was 83 percent of that for men; in 1969, it was 88 percent. Steele and Ward found that the women MBAs fell further behind as their careers con-

tinued. When they had been out of graduate school for 25 years, the women received only half as much compensation as their male classmates.[17] In a 1978 survey, the Association of MBA Executives found that women MBAs still tend to earn less than their male counterparts and to have fewer employees under their supervision. However, these findings could reflect differences in experience and age since the women respondents were generally younger than the male MBAs.[18]

Surveys of more recent groups of women MBAs have produced more optimistic results. Robertson draws a profile of the female "pioneers" from the Harvard Business School of 1973, the first class to have as many as 5 percent women. Five years after graduation, all 34 were in the labor force with a median compensation for those working full-time of $32,250.[19] However, Robertson's study, and another by Anne Harlan, which sampled female and male Harvard MBAs from a 15-year period, show that the women are much less likely to hold upper-level managerial positions and be involved in determining policy.[20] Gordon and Strober also examined a pioneer cohert, women MBAs from Stanford, 1974. While they report the starting salaries of male and female graduates to be nearly equal, they found the life goals and expectations of the females affected by social conventions; e.g., women assigned significantly less importance to wealth than the men did, and they desired and expected lower salary levels than the men.[21]

Some researchers doubt that the increase of women with business training will be adequate to affect the future composition of the managerial labor force. Stephen Schneider argues that the focus of women and business on discrimination and affirmative action has meant "the real problems of education, training and entrance into the professions receive less emphasis, and availability remains low."[22] Based on his mathematical models of the "labor supply creation process," Schneider projects that by 1985 women will make substantial gains in the labor force of accountants, but that women will make only very limited improvement in their representation in other business areas. Although there will be increasing numbers of female degree earners and entrants into the labor force, Schneider believes the proportion of women in the business profession will increase only minimally because of (a) the relative participation of men and women in the initial labor force, and (b) women's departure rates due to family commitments.

The high departure rates for women must be reduced if business is serious about developing women managers, especially in the event of a "managerial crunch." In an older, monumental British project, Fogarty, Rapoport, and Rapoport examined the careers and family lives of female directors and managers in corporations, the BBC, and the Civil Service. They demonstrated that women provide "many of the ablest candidates for high-level careers; women with a strong career commitment and a capacity for job performance in the same range as that of men, but with a different life-cycle and time-table of availability for work."[23] Fogarty argues that it is

economic and practicable for employers to adapt to the different life cycle of women caused by the "small-child break" in women's careers. Measures to redesign senior positions and the career patterns that might lead married women to them would improve the quality of top appointments by widening the field of candidates, improve the performance of women in junior positions who would no longer feel like second-class citizens, and relieve potential shortages of well-qualified staff. Fogarty suggests adaptations of employment practices (e.g., institutionalizing maternity leave, part-time work, flexible hours, relaunching, and accelerating back to the top) to enable women to combine having children with a chance of promotion to senior posts. However, in none of the fields where Fogarty has studied women managers have such measures been applied by individual employers.[24]

Recently, Fogarty and his British research team returned to study the progress of the women managers they had interviews a decade earlier. In this fascinating re-study, Fogarty found that there was less chance at the end of the 1970s than in the 1960s that women's quit rates in their first years of employment would substantially exceed men's. However, in examining the barriers to women's advancement in mid-career, the major problem was the continuing failure of companies to provide adequately or flexibly for women with family responsibilities (e.g., reinstatement after a career break). Fogarty's re-studies conclude that, unless major changes are made in this respect, the large increase in the number of women entering career lines which could lead to the top is still unlikely to be reflected in a corresponding increase in the number who actually get there.[25]

There exists no study of the careers and family lives of female managers in the United States comparable to the British study by Fogarty,et al. But, as they point out, their research findings apply to other industrialized, urbanized countries. Although there have been isolated appeals to consider ways to maintain the continuity of the female manager's work experience,[26] most American analysts still focus on getting women into the managerial pool rather than redesigning jobs to retain them.

However, this "small-child break" and its effect on limiting women's availability to move upward in the corporate hierarchy may be another example of how quickly the research assumptions in this area are becoming outdated in the United States. Schneider does not discuss in detail how he calculates the "separation" rates for women leaving the profession, but past patterns may be an inaccurate guide. In the last eight years, among all female workers, the largest increase in labor force participation has been among women with children under 3 years of age.[27] The pattern of continuous participation in the workforce after the birth of children may become even more common among women managers whose careers and good, well-paying jobs are more likely to entice them to return to work than would be the case if they had less desirable positions.[28]

NOTES

[1]Schneider, *The Availability of Minorities and Women*, p. 98.

[2]E.g., Patton, "The Coming Scramble for Executive Talent."

[3]Miner, *The Human Constraint;* Miner, "The Real Crunch in Managerial Manpower." Miner's prediction is supported in a recent study by Fottler and Bain, "Sex Differences in Occupational Aspirations." In this study of high school seniors in Alabama, few students of either sex aspired to managerial careers.

[4]For overview, see Crawford, *Women in Middle Management,* pp. 6-20, and Speizer, *Role Models, Mentors and Sponsors.* Among the better works are: Almquist and Angrist, "Role Model Influences on College Women's Career Aspirations"; Almquist, "Sex Stereotypes in Occupational Choice"; Miner, "Motivation to Manage Among Women"; Tipton, "Attitudes Towards Women's Roles in Society and Vocational Interests"; Ahrons, "Counselor's Perceptions of Career Image of Women"; Buzenberg, "Women's Career-Femininity-Marriage."

[5]See, for example, Fottler and Bain, "Sex Differences in Occupational Aspirations."

[6]Brito and Jusenius, "Occupational Expectations for Age 35."

[7]N.S. Barrett, "Women in the Job Market" in *The Subtle Revolution,* p. 53.

[8]Astin, King and Richardson, *The American Freshman.*

[9]Fox, "Business School Survey," pp. 3, 6.

[10]Calculated from U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *A Statistical Portrait of Women.*

[11]Robertson, "Women M.B.A.'s, Harvard '73."

[12]Fox, "Business School Survey," pp. 3, 6.

[13]Lyle and Ross, *Women in Industry,* p. 81.

[14]Some work along these lines is being done in doctoral dissertations; see e.g., McCuen, "Psychological Attributes of Male and Female Students in a Collegiate Business School."

[15]See, e.g., Blitz, "Women in the Professions."

[16]Harlan, *A Comparison of Careers for Male and Female MBAs;* Endicott, *The Endicott Report 1978;* Business and Professional Women's Foundation, *Women in Management.* The BPW study is a survey of recipients of the BPW/Sears-Roebuck Foundation Loan Fund for women in graduate business studies.

[17]Steele and Ward, "M.B.A.'s: Mobile, Well Situated, Well Paid."

[18]"AMBA-Zehnder MBA Survey Charts International Career and Salary Trends."

[19]Robertson, "Women M.B.A.'s, Harvard, '73."

[20]Harlan, *A Comparison of Careers for Male and Female MBAs.*

[21]Gordon and Strober, "Initial Observations on a Pioneer Cohort: 1974 Women MBAs."

[22]Schneider, *The Availability of Minorities and Women,* p. iv.

[23]Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport, *Women in Top Jobs: Four Studies in Achievement.*

[24]Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport, *Sex, Career and Family,* esp. pp. 464 ff.

[25]Fogarty, Allen and Walters, *Women in Top Jobs 1968-1978.*

[26]See, e.g., Biles and Pryatel, "Myths, Management and Women"; Schwartz, "New Work Patterns — For Better Use of Womanpower."

[27]U.S. Dept. of Commerce, *A Statistical Portrait of Women,* Table 6-6.

[28]Smith, *Subtle Revolution,* p. 46.

SECTION V

Stereotypes of Manager Characteristics

Occupational Sex Typing and the Image of the Executive

While more women are entering male-dominated occupations, the integration of women into positions of authority within business organizations has achieved only limited success. Differential treatment of women has been reported in selection, promotion policies, financial compensation, and performance ratings.[1] After reviewing research on possible explanations for this discrimination, Terborg et al. assert that it

> appears untenable to conclude that differential treatment of women vis-a-vis management positions is justified using behavioral criteria. A more probable explanation for the differential treatment of women may be found in the existence of pervasive and persistent sex-role stereotypes.[2]

Sex-role stereotypes impede the advancement of women in the managerial workforce through the creation of *occupational sex-typing*. According to Robert K. Merton, "occupations can be described as 'sex-typed' when a very large majority of those in them are of one sex and when there is an associated normative expectation that this is as it should be."[3] The typical American image of a manager is masculine; however, the individual tasks included in management are not strongly identified with either sex unless they are presented in the context of the managerial role. The identification of managerial success with masculinity and the behavioral correlates of such stereotyping have been popular topics of research on women and management.

The existence of a "male managerial model" and the relationship between male/female stereotypes and the image of the manager has been established by many investigators. Fifteen years ago, *Harvard Business Review* surveyed two thousand executives and discovered that 51 percent of the male executives believed that women are "temperamentally unfit for management."[4] In the past decade, managers have become more cautious about verbalizing such opinions, but they still persist. The ideal manager is perceived as male in character: competitive, aggressive, dominant, firm, vigorous, and rational. Against this standard, women are perceived as inadequate. They are characterized as not competitive, valuing social skills, person-oriented, emotional, intuitive, unambitious, and dependent.[5] In Burrow's survey of 1800 members of the American Management Association, emotionalism and lack of motivation/interest/ambition were cited as reasons for women's lack of advancement.[6]

When the respondents in an experiment by Cecil, Paul and Olins were asked to rate a male and a female applicant on qualities they would look for in a "white collar job," but with no specific job described, the participants chose traits that reflected their image of women performing clerical-secretarial roles and men in managerial roles.[7] O'Leary also confirms that it is the male, not the female, sex-role stereotype which coincides with the managerial model, since the characteristics most commonly ascribed to males comprise a "competency" cluster including such attributes as problem-solving and decision-making ability. On the other hand, the qualities ascribed to the female population reflect a "warmth-expressiveness" cluster including such characteristics as warmth and social skills.[8]

The widespread acceptance of occupational sex typing is documented by investigators who have shown that these attitudes are shared by both male and female managers, by students in managerial training, by executives, and by U.S. citizens and members of other industrial societies. In an analysis of the relationship between management characteristics and sex-role stereotypes, Schein tested 300 male middle managers and found that successful middle managers are perceived to possess characteristics more commonly attributed to men than to women. Schein obtained the same results in a replication of this study sampling 167 female middle managers. Schein's results imply that female managers are as likely as male managers to make personnel decisions and evaluations with a bias in favor of men.[9] Other studies have found no significant difference between female and male managers with respect to their dependence on selected sex-role and work stereotypes.[10]

Some commentators have predicted considerable improvement in women's position because they believe the younger generation of men will be less limited by stereotypic attitudes and will contribute to a more supportive environment.[11] Although this is an area that needs more research, the existent studies of future managers do not completely support this prediction. In a sample of 200 undergraduates and 300 executives, Basil reported more prejudice against women among the students. A majority (84 percent) of the college men, as compared to 63 percent of the businessmen, believed that women, simply because of their sex, did not belong in management.[12] While male and female MBA students view the effective manager quite similarly, half of the males in a test by Schermerhorn et al. give the concept of manager a distinctly masculine connotation. Female students view the concept as sexually neuter. Schermerhorn warns that "the seeds are already sown among this sampling of males for later stereotypic responses."[13] Interestingly, in a smaller sample in this same experiment, a positive trend was evident in the data with 35 percent of the males and 41 percent of the females looking forward to a sexually-integrated work situation with men and women as colleagues. (The researchers did not speculate whether the male students assumed that in any "colleague" situation they would still be in superior jobs.)

Much of this student antipathy toward women results from the fear of

more competition for fewer jobs in a poor economy. Fukami examined the attitudes of MBA students toward women managers both before and after job offers were extended to second-year students and found an increase in negative attitudes toward women managers for males without previous work experience. These students may have found themselves at a disadvantage in the job offering period.[14]

A feeling of greater economic security may be one reason researchers, as far back as the *Harvard Business Review* study (1965), have found that *older* male managers show a greater acceptance of women as managers.[15] Similarly, the older the respondent, either male or female, the more likely that they believe there is no difference between working with male or female managers.[16] Schein demonstrates that even the perceptual "male-typing" of the managerial job declines among older managers. She speculates that the stereotypical view of women may have been modified by the greater exposure of the experienced manager to female managers. But even more influential, Schein suggests, may be the altered roles of the female social peers and wives of these older men. After the age group in their early twenties, the proportion of women in the labor force declines and reaches a second peak of participation at about age fifty. Thus, older male managers may have increased interaction with women whose lives are more oriented to the role of worker than to that of mother-homemaker.[17]

More research is needed to determine the characteristics (age, employment status of wife, etc.) of the male managers most likely to be supportive of women's progress. It will become increasingly important for businesswomen to identify such potential allies since, in the future, the impetus beyond a certain point in the corporate hierarchy may have to come from the empathy and actions of powerful men. Recently, there have been a few journalistic profiles of such men, whose personal commitment and support has resulted in their company's establishment of progressive hiring and promotion programs for women, e.g., Al Neuharth of the Gannett newspaper chain.[18]

Sex stereotyping in relation to women as managers also operates in cultures outside the United States.[19] In surveying the literature on women and management, it is evident that there is a great need for monographs on businesswomen in different cultures and for comparative studies of their careers. One example of the rich possibilities of such analysis is the survey work of the Turin Centre of the International Labour Office in collaboration with the Italian Women Executives Association. In reporting their results, Sergio Ferrari describes the executives' social and economic background and their styles of management. In a discussion of career difficulties, Ferrari compares stereotypes affecting Italian women executives with those affecting American women executives. For example, "Men are reluctant to accept supervision from a woman" is the prejudice most frequently encountered by the Italian women, but it is the sixth on the list for Americans. Ferrari attributes this difference to the continuing influence in Italy of the traditional patriarchal structure of the agrarian family. When

asked what actions would improve their situation in the respective countries, the Italian respondents advised women to demonstrate to men that they are capable, while in the United States, the main responsibility is placed on society to encourage women by equalizing opportunities. Italian women executives, then, see men as the main obstacle to their careers, a belief almost never voiced in the Americans' responses to the survey.[20]

Despite some encouraging signs that sex-role stereotypes of both men and women have undergone some changes in the last decade, the linkage between masculinity and the managerial occupation has proven to be one of the most persistent beliefs. Managers of both sexes continue to perceive an overlap between the traits of a good manager and of a male, although this attributional pattern is less pronounced among female than among male respondents. In a review of the literature on sex-role stereotyping and other barriers to career advancement for women, A.R. Gold reports that:

> Almost all these studies have found no overall differences in the degree of [ability, intelligence or competence] attributed to men and women, even when the individuals being judged were functioning in 'masculine' fields. The major exceptions to this are the studies concerned with managerial skills; here, the evidence suggests a strong bias against women.[22]

Researchers have only begun investigating what experiences and circumstances would intend to lessen this stereotypic thinking, but much of the initial work on this subject shows conflicting results. For example, Hagen and Kahn found that men liked competent women less when they interacted with them than when merely observing them interact with others. Other data in their study suggests that interaction with competent women, especially in competitive situations, may stimulate some sort of fear in men which could lead to hostility.[23] However, in an investigation of sex preferences for bosses and professionals (BPs) Ferber et al. discovered that, for both men and women, exposure to female BPs decreases preferences for male BPs and tends to break down stereotypic images. They conclude:

> policies which open such jobs to women should prove successful because the presence of women in itself tends to reduce prejudice against them . . . Sex stereotyping may therefore decrease if competent female bosses and professionals exist in such number that exposure is unavoidable.[24]

Male Managers, Female Managers, and the Androgynous Model. Making Manager a Neuter Term

In the last two years, there has been a decrease in the studies of stereotypes. This is fortunate because many of the investigations were

poorly and simplistically structured, used questionable sampling techniques, and relied on obsolete or transparent tests. However, these dubious findings have been widely reported in the business press, and this may be an instance where academic researchers have done a disservice to women in business.[25] Readers of such stereotype surveys, especially if they agree with the results, are likely to focus on the conclusions without being in a position to assess the validity of the research design. These studies have reinforced a false sense of what qualities are feminine and what qualities are masculine. Having established which characteristics are male and which are female, they perpetuate the idea that managers have to have those traits — aggressiveness, strength, etc. — that are categorized as male. However, current writing in management theory emphasizes the situational context of leadership, and the fact that there are many styles of leadership which are effective.

Recent analyses of the executive image in relation to women have begun to assert two new theories that may eventually prove to be as limiting to women's advancement as the male managerial model: the female nurturer/manager and the androgynous manager. This first argument is based upon some of the same assumptions described in the preceding discussion of the managerial image. Occupational sex typing of the manager's job has not been totally synonomous with the masculine sex-role stereotype. Certain characteristics, such as Helpful, Intuitive, and Understanding, are "employee-centered" or "consideration" behaviors expected of managers and more commonly ascribed to women than to men.[26] Several commentators have emphasized such stereotypic feminine behavior as a rationale to increase the involvement of women in management. Hackamack and Solid believe women possess attributes peculiar to them, such as "feminine responsiveness" which give them a distinct advantage as managers.[27] Roslyn Willett argues that men and women differ in significant ways, with men being more aggressive and prone to fantasize and with women being more perceptive to reality and likely to sustain interest in completing a real job. According to Willett, these differences make it imperative that women are represented in high-level decision-making in order to provide balance and a "complementary distribution of working talent between the two sexes."[28] William Goode summarizes and articulates this attitude regarding the nurturer/manager connection:

> If our stereotypes of women are correct, the skills and behavior they acquire in becoming a woman are exactly those of good managers: they are trained in human relations, not test tubes and machinery; in insight; in the organization and maintenance of a social unit, the family; in command not through arbitrary orders, but through persuasion and participation; in taking care of subordinates and serving their needs so that they will produce better. If they can become good homemakers, surely they could become excellent managers.[29]

This image of the female nurturer/manager is reinforced by contemporary analyses of leadership in the corporation which describe the dichotomy in executive behavior between "task orientation" and "people orientation." Women are alleged to be more successful in the managing process in relationships with other people.[30] One of the most articulate presentations of a version of this argument is in the work of J. Lipman-Blumen and H.J. Leavitt. Warning that "the relational side of U.S. organizations needs shoring up," they argue for "relational managers," i.e., individuals with an achieving style that helps, supports, and backs up other people and that minimizes competitiveness. They assert that the entry of women to the executive suite is one of the trends leading in the direction of more relational managerial styles. Although business initially interpreted women's entry as a "government-imposed hardship," those organizations which have brought women into their managerial ranks now have an "important advantage": "access to a large number of people in our society who traditionally have been trained to a very high level of relational orientation and skill." Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt believe there is such significant benefit in building relational organizations that they urge a rethinking of the criteria used in selecting women applicants for managerial posts:

> We usually have looked for 'tough' women who can survive in tough male organizations. The status quo is thus perpetuated. We suggest, instead, that managers try promoting some more typically 'female'women, contributory, collaborative, vicarious women; and then try to make small modifications in their organization to support the presence of such managers. The game is not just to train women to behave like men, but also to utilize 'feminine' women in order to move the organization.[31]

Certainly, there is some value in arguments such as those of Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt with their positive perspective on women's contributions to business needs. However, the female nurturer/manager model and its related applications have the potential to become a new feminine business mystique. These well-meaning extensions of the traditional nurturer stereotype may have equally negative outcomes for women. These arguments are based in traditional thinking and, in practical terms, reinforce the stereotypic expectation that women managers will be appropriate in people-oriented jobs, such as personnel, or in support jobs, such as assistant to males. These jobs have long been female enclaves from which few women have risen in the corporate hierarchy.[32] (It is not a coincidence that currently the most new jobs for female executives are in personnel departments.)[33] Bringing the values of caring or nurturing into the organizational setting is a desirable objective for business, but this cannot be accomplished by assuming women executives will satisfy this need. Women who are sufficiently motivated to pursue a business career despite cultural obstacles are unlikely to perform a nurturing function. Women executives tend to be closer to a male model, to be competitive, analytical, and ambitious. Judith

Lannon summarizes the danger of creating new adaptations of the manager stereotype: "while the myth of the male manager may persist (only men need apply) a preoccupation with hiring women may give rise to another equally limiting myth: the myth of the female nurturer/manager (only women need apply)."[34]

In the literature on managerial image, a second model currently under discussion is that of the anrogynous manager. This idea originates in the theories of S.L. Bem, who advocated the concept of androgyny, a mixture of male and female attributes in an individual, as respresenting a more flexible standard of psychological health than sex typed behavior. Since researchers had observed an association between androgyny and more effective behavior in a variety of nonorganizational settings, they began to suggest the applicability of the concept to the corporate situation: the more effective manager may also be androgynous."

Researchers using this concept have chosen to stress different aspects of the male/female mixture in the androgynous equation. P.E. Butler emphasizes the need for women with traditional female traits (e.g., yielding, soft-spoken) to acquire the characteristics of self-assertiveness associated with men. In this way, women can become androgynous or "fully human": "Powerful women . . . embody the concept of androgyny. They freely express themselves without regard to whether their behavior is masculine or feminine."[36]

N.J. Adler applies the concept to a specific context, international management, which seems to require an androgynous value orientation. Adler proposes a model of the "androgynous international manager" who "uses both characteristically male and characteristically female attitudes and behaviors while working in a wide range of international cultures." Adler emphasizes the female component of the androgynous equation. In her elaboration of this model, she points out that the woman's role has traditionally included skills necessary for success overseas (e.g., group-orientation), but, when corporations make decisions on foreign assignments, they ignore the correlation between female role attributes and certain cultural orientations."

A. Haemmerli goes one step further to suggest that sex-role differentiation may be an asset rather than a hindrance for female executives in a multicultural environment. She observes that managerial traits labelled as "Failings of U.S. Women in Business" are comparable to the "Qualities Needed for International Work," as, for example, in the following listing:

Failings of U.S. Women in Business	**Qualities Needed For International Work**
Passive/Reactive approach	Ability to respond to context . . . (rather than actively) . . . imposing a priori attitudes on the situation
Detail Orientation	Willingness and ability to:

- do detailed homework on the new environment; and
- notice, and act on, seemingly minor but often critical 'details' of cultural attitudes and behaviors."

Adler and Haemmerli's analyses of international management represent an interesting way to rethink a particular issue, one of growing concern as corporate women continue to be discriminated against in the international assignments that may be necessary for the further development of their careers. However, the androgynous model, like the female nurturer/manager approach, is likely to restrict rather than liberate. While the concept may provide a different emphasis to the consideration of desirable managerial attributes, it does so by strengthening stereotypic thinking and clinging to limited and limiting concepts of the characteristics of the sexes. Sex typing and sex-role distinctions may be of use to the psychologist, but, as R. Lekachman writes, "The real world, as we all endure it, is notoriously full of timid men and aggressive women."[9]

Women managers would benefit from more research that focused on their situation in relation to managerial functions and responsibilities, the measurement and improvement of performance, and the assessment of leadership style most effective in a given setting. The discussion of women managers should broaden from gender to the generic.

NOTES

[1]See, e.g., Dipboye, Fromkin and Wiback, "Relative Importance of Applicant Sex"; Shaw, "Differential Impact of Negative Stereotyping in Employee Selection"; Cohen and Bunker, "Subtle Effects of Sex-Role Stereotypes on Recruiter's Hiring Decisions"; Day and Stogdill, "Leader Behavior of Male and Female Supervisors"; Sommers, "Occupational Ranking for Men and Women by Earnings"; Treiman and Terrell, "Sex and the Process of Status Attainment"; Bartol and Butterfield, "Sex Effects in Evaluating Leaders"; Deaux and Taynor, "Evaluation of Male and Female Ability: Bias Works Two Ways"; Hamner, Kim, Baird and Bigoness, "Race and Sex as Determinants of Ratings by Potential Employers."

[2]Terborg, Peters, Ilgen and Smith, "Organizational and Personal Correlates of Attitudes Toward Women as Managers," p. 90. Also see excellent discussion of other factors operating in differential treatment in Terborg, "Women in Management: A Research Review."

[3]Quoted in Epstein, *Woman's Place: Options and Limits in Professional Careers*, p. 152.

[4]Bowman, Worthy and Greyson, "Problems in Review: Are Women Executives People?"

[5]Stereotypes are reviewed in Larwood and Wood, *Women in Management*, chapters 2, 3, 4; Schwartz, *The Sex Barrier in Business*, esp. 79-83, 92-95; Loring and Wells, *Breakthrough: Women into Management*, esp. 131-35; Butler, *Self-Assertion for Women, A Guide to Becoming Androgynous*, chapter 1; Dipboye, "Women as Managers — Stereotypes and Realities," in *Women in Management*, ed. Stead, pp. 2-9.

[6]Burrow, *Developing Women Managers: What Needs to be Done?*, p. 12.

[7]Cecil, Olins and Paul, "Perceived Importance of Selected Variables Used to Evaluate Male and Female Job Applicants."

[8]O'Leary, "Some Attitudinal Barriers to Occupational Aspirations in Women."

[9]Schein, "The Relationship Between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics"; Schein, "Relationships Between Sex Role Stereotypes and and Requisite Management Characteristics Among Female Managers."

[10]Lyle and Ross, *Women in Industry*, pp. 85-89.

[11]See, e.g., Loring and Wells, *Breakthrough: Women into Management*, p. 35.

[12]Basil, *Women in Management*.

[13]Schermerhorn, Snelson and Leader, "Women in Management: The MBA Students' Perspective."

[14]Fukami, "The Effects of Socialization and Sex Roles on Changes in Attitudes Toward Women Managers."

[15]Bowman et al., "Problems in Review: Are Women Executives People?" Compare Stanford, "Attitudes Toward Women: Critical Background Predictions and the Effect of a Managerial Development and Feminist Awareness Seminar," which examines background factors related to liberal attitudes toward women including such variables as age, occupation of mother, and participation in softball or basketball.

[16]Burrow, *Developing Women Managers: What Needs to be Done?*, p. 16.

[17]Schein, "The Relationship Between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisited Management Characteristics," p. 99. However, from these studies, one cannot conclude that older managers make a point of actively *supporting* women as managers. If so, group acceptance and affirmative action would long since have occurred. Terborg et al., "Organizational and Personal Correlates," found no correlation between rank in the organization and attitudes toward women as managers.

[18]C. Doudna and C. Rupp, "Up the Masthead: The Push for Power in the Press."

[19]See. e.g., Safilios-Rothschild, "The Options of Greek Men and Women"; Sekiguchi, "Social Location of the Graduate Women: A Comparative Study of Japan and West Germany on Their Occupations"; Lannon, "Male and Female Values in Management" (United Kingdom only).

[20]Ferrari, "The Italian Women Executive."

[21]Massengill and DiMarco, "Sex-role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics: A Current Replication."

[22]Gold, "Reexamining Barriers to Women's Career Development." For a recent example, see Mainiero, Powell and Butterfield, "Sex Role Identity: A Predictor of Managerial Aspirations."

[23]Hagen and Kahn, "Discrimination Against Competent Women."

[24]Ferber, Huber, and Spitze, "Preference for Men as Bosses and Professionals." Quote, p. 474.

[25]Kagan, "How Management Myths Hurt Women."

[26]Schein, "The Relationship Between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics." On the fusion of "masculine" and "feminine" attributes in women managers, see Parker, "The Yin and the Yang: Do Women Managers Have the Best of Both Worlds?" and Banfield, "Women in Middle Management Positions."

[27]Hackamack and Solid, "The Woman Executive."

[28]Willett, "Working in 'A Man's World': The Woman Executive," in *Woman in Sexist Society: Studies in Power and Powerlessness*, ed. Gornick and Moran.

[9]Goode, "Family Life of the Successful Woman" in Ginzberg, *Corporate Lib*, p. 99. Elizabeth Janeway claims that Goode overlooks a significant managerial quality which has been lacking in women's past experience; even within the home, women have not regularly acted as overt and conscious decision-makers (see Janeway, "Family Life in Transition," in Ginzberg, *Corporate Lib*, p. 119).

[10]For a review and expansion of the literature on these theories, see Lipman-Blumen, "A Model of Direct and Relational Achieving Styles," in *Achievement Motivation*, ed. Fyons.

[11]Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt, "A Case for the Relational Manager," pp. 27-41.

[12]For a differing view of the possibilities of such positions, see Chapter 5, "Are There 'Women' Jobs in the Management Hierarchy?" in Lynch, *The Executive Suite — Feminine Style*.

[13]"Women: Where the Management Jobs Are."

[14]Lannon, "Male vs. Female Values in Management," p. 12. See also Vaden and Lynn, "The Administrative Person: Will Women Bring a Differing Morality to Management?"

[15]For a discussion of Bem and a test of the model, see Powell and Butterfield, "The 'Good Manager': Masculine or Androgynous?"

[16]Butler, *Self-Assertion for Women, A Guide to Becoming Androgynous*, p. 296.

[17]Adler, "Women as Androgynous Managers: A Conceptualization of the Potential for American Women in International Management." Quote, p. 419.

[18]Haemmerli, "Women in International Business." Paper prepared for Women in International Business Conference sponsored by Chase World Information Corporation, New York, New York, July 11, 1978. Cited in Adler, "Women as Androgynous Managers: A Conceptualization of the Potential for American Women in International Management," pp. 417-18.

[19]Lekachman, "On Economic Equality," p. 101.

SECTION VI

The Behavioral Consequences of Stereotypes: Discrimination

Differential Treatment of Women Managers

Investigators have documented the behavioral consequences of stereotypical thinking among men and women, undergraduates and executives, in a wide range of situations. For example, using both practicing managers and undergraduates as subjects, researchers have found that males are selected for challenging managerial positions over females with identical qualifications.[1] In one of the most extensive experiments, Rosen and Jerdee surveyed 1,500 *Harvard Business Review* subscribers in management positions. The participants, given a brief history of a hypothetical organization, were asked to assume the role of an official in the organization. They were then given a series of eleven communications and asked to respond to each incident by recommending appropriate managerial action, e.g., choosing between two candidates for a position involving travel, nominating an employee to attend a training conference, giving advice to a philandering junior manager. The responses of the executives showed two general patterns of differential treatment: "(1) there is greater organizational concern for the careers of men then for those of women, and (2) there is a degree of skepticism about women's abilities to balance work and family demands."[2] Rosen and Jerdee's study was replicated by Hobart with undergraduates in business administration. The results showed that both male and female future managers place men and women in stereotypical roles, although Hobart reported a lessening of discriminatory attitudes in the area of career demands and family obligations.[3]

One of the areas in which discrimination is the most clearly visible and statistically verifiable is the whole matter of wages and compensation. In 1978, the average money income for "managers and administrators" was $20,024. Of this total, men had an average income of $22,956, while women employed in this category had an average income of $10,695, less than half that of their male counterparts.[4] The earnings gap between men and women is graphically reported by the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor: in 1977 only 6 percent of the female managers and administrators were earning more than the median income for all such workers. This is only a very slight increase from 1973, in which 4.5 percent of women managers received higher income than the median income for all managers and administrators.[5]

In addition to these government statistics, extensive investigations have shown ongoing difficulties in the area of salary discrimination. In a study of Harvard MBA graduates from the classes of 1960-1975, Harlan

and Jelinek found that women had lower starting salaries than their male classmates, and the gap increased with time.[6] An exploratory study by Badavas et al. found similar data in the experiences of MBAs from the Amos Tuck School (Dartmouth).[7]

One of the most detailed analyses of managerial compensation is a joint study of international and domestic MBAs conducted by the Association of MBA Executives and Egon-Zehnder International. From the responses of approximately 5,000 MBAs employed in middle- and senior-level management throughout the world, this study concluded that American women MBAs earn less than their male counterparts, and this salary differential becomes even more striking with age. Moreover, the women respondents held positions of less power and authority in their companies, and supervised smaller workforces. They were concentrated in staff and line management jobs, rather than in senior executive positions.[8]

AMBA-Zehnder propose several reasons to account for these discrepancies in compensation and status: (1) the women respondents were generally younger than the men; the age difference could account for part of the salary difference. (2) Fewer women MBAs had technical backgrounds, the training necessary for consideration for some of the most lucrative career fields. (3) More women have entered lower-paying fields, and some have restricted their salary levels by refusing to relocate. These factors certainly contribute to the situation, but as the study further suggests, "socially ingrained attitudes about women and work could be responsible in part for the lower salaries."[9]

The inadequacy of any explanation other than discrimination becomes obvious in inquiries that have compared the salaries of matched male/female managers. Studies which have accounted for control factors including occupational prestige, supervisory responsibility, length of employment, tenure on present job, numbers of hours worked, and education all show women receiving lower median earnings than the male/female total.[10] For example, Larwood and Wood point out that in the construction industry, the economics of supply and demand should reward with a premium the scarce number of executive women who would be qualified to work in this field. However, when the experiential and educational factors are the same, women in construction management are still at a salary disadvantage, earning only 73 percent of the wage earned by men.[11] Although many managerial women may believe lower pay is the fate only of female workers in lower-status, female-dominated occupations, the wage differential of women managers is actually worse than the national average. Nationally, women earn 62 percent of what men earn; women in managerial and administrative jobs brings in only 60 percent of what men earn.[12]

The differential treatment of women managers, evident in many areas including salary discrimination, is interconnected with sex-role stereotypes, but the effect of these stereotypes in determining behavior has usually been inferred in post hoc explanations of experimental findings. Peters, Terborg and Taynor have attempted to measure subjects' attitudes toward women

in business *prior* to the subjects' involvement in a testing situation. Peters et al. developed the Women as Managers Scale (WAMS), which includes items describing general managerial traits (e.g., leadership) and female-specific stereotypical behaviors/traits believed to represent barriers to women's success in managerial jobs (e.g., child-rearing responsibilities).[13] Although this measurement device has been criticized, other studies have supported the validity of WAMS.[14] Using the WAMS with a sample of 180 male and 100 female employees of an international distributing company, Terborg et al. showed that (a) the most favorable WAMS attitudes were expressed by women with formal education; (b) WAMS attitudes for both men and women were positively correlated with views toward the women's movement; (c) men and women with high salaries had more favorable attitudes toward women as managers than did hourly workers.[15]

Such a test as WAMS could be useful to predict who would be likely to discriminate against women, especially in the types of personnel decisions commonly required in the business world. However, Herbert and Yost assert that "given the current climate fostered by the women's movement and federal anti-bias requirements," the usefulness of the WAMS is diminished by its transparency and its susceptibility to being faked.[16] Cohen and Leavengood also discount the utility of WAMS and suggest that "internal attitudes and public behaviors may be under very different kinds of controls and as a result there may be little resemblance between the two."[17]

As in the WAMS controversy, other studies on the effects of occupational sex typing arrive at conflicting conclusions which reflect two of the methodological problems of attitudinal research: (1) what data should be presented to subjects, and (2) how do findings differ between laboratory experiments and field studies? In tests of the effects of applicant's sex on performance ratings, different results were obtained depending upon the amount and type of information provided the rater and upon the employment status of the ratee. For instance, in one report, female applicants received lower ratings than male applicants on potential performance measures and were selected less often than males for managerial positions. In contrast, Hamner found that with equal levels of objective performance, female applicants were rated superior to male job applicants.[18] Both studies used undergraduate management students as subjects, but a closer examination reveals that the raters in the Hamner study were provided with more information on the ratees, including a filmed sample of actual performance for each hypothetical applicant. In considering how their job performance is evaluated, businesswomen should note the findings of this research which suggests that stereotypes are mose salient when objective behavioral data are inadequate and raters fall back on traditional concepts to form judgments. In situations where specific rules are operative or where adequate conditions for observation are provided, the raters may tend to make judgments based on the individual's behavior rather than on personal characteristics.[19]

Most of the work on this aspect of women as managers has been done in laboratory studies, primarily using students as subjects. This pattern represents another major weakness in this research because the external validity of the findings has yet to be determined. Moreover, when some of the hypotheses have been tested in the field, the conclusions are so different as to suggest that the laboratory results may be artifactual. Laboratory studies involve strangers interacting with strangers, or with printed descriptions, in short-term, artificial situations. The variable of sex may be one of the few cues available to the subject in making the judgment; and, as described above, the absence of behavioral data causes people to base their responses on stereotypes. Too much of the laboratory research has relied on students as subjects; this reliance has been more the result of faculty/researcher convenience than of conscious project design. While there is a need for more work on the attitudes of future managers toward women (e.g., longitudinal studies of the same group of students as they enter and advance through their managerial careers), it is doubtful if students' views reflect corporate reality and the range of attitudes possible in executives of different ages and varied work experience. The inclination to generalize from a student population to a non-specific one is furthered by researchers who refer to the conclusions of earlier work without identifying their limitations in design.

Field studies dealing with on-going, real-life setting yield different results. In working situations with leaders and subordinates, researchers have consistently found no differences between male and female leaders in performance, behavior, or subordinate satisfaction.[20] Results from field studies are often difficult to interpret because situational variables require adequate controls. When these controls are included in the design of field studies, the influence of sex stereotyping is nonsignificant. For instance, Osborn and Vicars report that once the demographic characteristics of leader and employee are considered and controlled, leader behavior and employee satisfaction are the same whether the supervisor is male or female.[21]

However, when research has been conducted within actual work environments, the emphasis has been on the attitudes and behavior of managers/leaders and their subordinates. In a review of studies seeking to explain the sex structuring of organizations, Bartol observes that there is little research on how manager's *superiors* perceive possible differences in male/female leadership style. Since promotion decisions are generally made by executives above the focal individual in the hierarchy, the lack of research constitutes a major gap in knowledge of the actual effects (or lack of them) of sex-stereotyping on career advancement for women. There is a need for more field studies to provide a better understanding of what Bartol terms "the total filtering processes of organizations and the roles various members play in them."[22] Such information on the formal and informal corporate structures would be of practical use to businesswomen since, increasingly, management specialists are urging a contingency management

style. This theory asserts that the success of a manager depends on the ability to recognize and adjust to the organizational situation in which he/she is operating.[23]

Opportunities for Women Managers: Has Affirmative Action Made Any Difference?

The discrimination which results from stereotypical thinking and occupational sex typing was the target of the federal legislation of the 1960s (Equal Pay Act, 1963; Title VII, Civil Rights Act, 1964) and the significant court cases of the early 1970s (e.g., Griggs v. Duke Power Co., 1971). Less than a decade has passed since the major consent decree involving American Telephone & Telegraph (1973), and slightly over fifteen years since the first anti-discrimination laws. In the course of historical change, this is a very short time span; for individuals experiencing a prolonged pattern of discrimination, this is a large part of their working life. Although there are limitations on the data that are available to this point, does the record of this period show that affirmative action has made any difference for women in managerial positions in the business community?

A small number of recent research studies offer analyses of the effects of this legislation and describe the factors in the corporate environment which can contribute to the successful implementation of affirmative action goals. The most extensive of these studies is that undertaken by The Conference Board and presented in two important reports by Ruth G. Shaeffer, Edith F. Lynton, and Helen Axel, entitled *Corporate Experiences in Improving Women's Job Opportunities* and Improving Job Opportunities for Women: A Chartbook Focusing on the Progress in Business.[24] These reports, based on an examination of 265 major companies, show the changes between 1970 and 1975 in male-female occupational patterns in the corporate sector and discuss "the nature of the change process, as viewed from a corporate perspective."[25] In these five years, representation of women workers in the corporate sector increased from 31 percent to 32 percent; representation of women as managers and administrators increased from 13 percent to 17 percent. This 22 percent increase in the number of women managers (compared with an 8 percent increase in the number of male managers) indicates a slow movement up the corporate ladder for women in this occupational category. Despite this gain, most women workers continue to be clustered in the traditional female jobs, such as retail and clerical work. No progress has been made in the higher-paid categories of skilled craft workers (5 percent female in 1970, 4 percent in 1975) and semiskilled operatives (37 percent female in 1970, 38 percent in 1975).[26]

From this Conference Board data, it is apparent that companies seeking to improve women's opportunities have put their greatest emphasis on

women managers, officials, and professionals. Shaeffer et al. delineate the reasons commonly offered by corporations for this greater emphasis on the higher-level white-collar jobs:

> the greater availability of qualified, willing candidates both internally and externally; the restricted availability of blue-collar job openings; the higher visibility of the managerial or professional jobs; the importance of providing female role models at higher organizational levels in order to encourage women at lower levels to try to move up, too; the fact that these are the entry jobs for recent female college graduates, who are likely to move on up in management; the greater control exerted by the headquarters personnel group with respect to these jobs; the need for the whole headquarters unit to take a leadership role so that it can then insist on other units following suit; pressure from compliance review officers; and (especially from companies in male-intensive industries) the fact that these categories are likely to be the most difficult ones in which to make progress.[27]

In analyzing by industry group the gains women made in the managerial and professional ranks, Shaeffer discovered that there has been considerably greater improvement in "the representation of women in the higher level job categories in the female-intensive industries." Female-intensive industries are those in which women constitute the largest proportion of the labor force, usually in low-paying, low-status jobs. Retailing, insurance, banking, communications, and some kinds of manufacturing, especially of non-durable goods, are female-intensive industries. Construction, electric and gas utitilities, mining, transportation, wholesale trade, and certain other kinds of manufacturing, especially of many durable goods, are male-intensive.[28] Shaeffer et al. report that in 1970, the representation of women in management and administration in male-intensive industries was 5 percent and in female-intensive industries, 19 percent. In 1975, the proportions were 6 percent and 23 percent.[29]

Moreover, this change process also seems to be related to company size. In all industries in the Conference Board survey, the very large corporations made measurable progress in increasing the percentage of women in virtually all of their better-paying, higher-status job categories. Shaeffer et al. suggest several reasons why larger firms are better able than are small companies to improve job opportunities for women:

> They do more internal training of employees. They have more staff available to help make sure that line managers understand what the EEO law requires and to aid them in making appropriate changes. But it should also be noted that some of the largest companies have really been under the gun under both Title VII and Executive Order 11246. *Stringent enforcement of the federal laws and regulations does seem to make a difference.*[30]

Shaeffer et al.'s conclusion about the importance of government pressure is supported further when the Conference Board data on the improvement in very large corporations is compared with an earlier study by Shepherd and Levin. Their research analyzed patterns in employment statistics in large firms in the 1960s, a period prior to the major regulatory development of the early 1970s. They found that large corporations had a poor representation of women in management; women's opportunities in the higher-level jobs were confined mainly to "a distinct subset of firms in traditional 'women's' industries."[31]

The progress that business can achieve when required to do so is best illustrated in the case of American Telephone & Telegraph (A.T.&T.). In 1973, A.T.&T. entered into a consent decree with the Department of Labor and the EEOC. The Bell System's operating companies were required to develop annual targets for hiring and promoting women in various jobs; to implement programs supporting affirmative action, including the Management Assessment Program for women college graduates already on the payroll; to make pay adjustments for certain management employees; and to institute an "affirmative action override" to permit the promotion of one qualified employee over another with longer service or better qualifications, if necessary to meet affirmative action targets. Over a six-year period, female representation in the ranks of officials and managers increased from 24 percent to 29 percent of the total A.T.&T. executive force. Women's participation in middle-management and above increased from 2 percent to 8 percent, and in second-level management from 11 percent to 21 percent. The percentage of women at entry-level management remained constant (44 percent).[32]

To reach their goals in middle-management, A.T.&T. utilized an assessment program which identified and advanced high-potential, underutilized female college graduates who had been hired earlier by the company but who had been denied equal access to the "fast-track" program provided to their male counterparts. In reviewing his company's efforts, Robert E. Beck, Assistant Vice President — Human Resources for A.T.&T., stated:

> our experience strongly suggests that real opportunities, organizational support, objective identification, challenging developmental assignments, good management of the processes and promotion based on performance are the foundations of effective affirmative action.[33]

How do other business men feel about their experiences with this government-mandated program? Barnhill-Hayes, a management consulting group, conducted a survey of the attitudes of employers toward affirmative action. The responses from nearly 300 companies indicate that corporate executives support the recent EEOC guidelines for affirmative action.[34] When asked if business has been expected "to assume too great a responsibility with regard to eliminating discrimination in society," the

respondents are divided, with half disagreeing and the other half agreeing with the statement. The executive respondents show a similar division when the question concerns their company specifically. Forty-seven percent state that the objectives of affirmative action are achievable within the framework of the way their business is conducted. An equally large number (50 percent) of the executives believe those goals are not achievable or are not sure.[35] However, the productivity argument which was often used in the past to resist affirmative action has been largely abandoned. An overwhelming majority of the executives surveyed contend that the productivity of their employees has not been diminished by affirmative action.[36]

The Barnhill-Hayes survey reveals that "bottom line" considerations remain the most influential in motivating companies to pursue affirmative action programs. Management's greatest concerns with respect to affirmative action are: possible fines to compensate for past discrimination (25 percent), the loss of government contracts (22 percent), and the prospect of adverse publicity (22 percent).[37] When queried about the obstacles to success in hiring minorities, the executives state that the biggest problem with the process is the lack of enough qualified minority candidates.[38] The Barnhill-Hayes survey concludes:

> Taken as a whole, this study shows that affirmative action has matured to the point where it is not simply the cause of activists only. Rather, affirmative action has advanced to the point where it has largely become a 'fact' of corporate life, and as such, is less likely to be diluted or unduly influenced by isolated court cases and incidents . . . Nonetheless, it is apparent that business still has a way to go in terms of demonstrating a genuine commitment to affirmative action and not relying on the 'can't find enough minority candidates' excuses."

Some of the misgivings of business executives expressed in the Barnhill-Hayes survey are well answered in one section of the Shaeffer study, which summarizes over 100 successful corporate experiences in improving official and managerial job opportunities for women. Specific cases cite the success of various procedures and recruiting/advancement activities which have helped companies achieve their EEO goals, although the usefulness of one particular procedure may be greater in one industry than in another business environment. The Shaeffer examples confirm that the "availability problem" can be solved. Success can be attributed to certain factors, such as (a) the clear commitment of top corporate management to improving job opportunities; (b) the accountability of line managers for attaining EEO goals; (c) an increase in the influence of the EEO staff and the corporate personnel department in the staffing process and its outcomes.[40]

The real long-term problem related to women executives is probably not their availability but the limits to their progress that are created by the flow (or absence thereof) through the business system itself. Flow-based analysis of an organization's human resources provides a quantitative base

from which to measure present personnel utilization and to predict changes in personnel assignments over periods of time. Models which measure and compare matched groups of male and female managerial employees, for example, can be used to assess hiring practices, promotion rates, and movements among job categories of a company, and can predict whether the company's policies to achieve EEO parity goals will be successful or whether additional strategies are indicated. Using such charts, Neil Churchill has estimated that it will take almost 30 years to achieve employment parity for women, even when affirmative action hiring and promotion policies produce appropriate numbers of women in lower-management within five years and appropriate representation of women in middle management within ten years. When one examines Churchill's charts of employee and management movement, it becomes clear that time is needed for women, hired now, to progress up the management ladder. Furthermore, the low attrition rate of predominantly male middle- and upper-management produces a drag effect counter to women's advancement. Churchill contends: "Unless a corporation is growing very rapidly or is experiencing very high top-level turnover, it has limited opportunities to effectuate change in the composition of its top-management group."[41]

A few studies have examined the whole career path of women managers through the corporation and have identified strategies that facilitate the process for the benefit of both individuals and organizations.[42] An excellent new book is Helen McLane's *Selecting, Developing and Retaining Women Executives.* McLane, an executive with the consulting firm of Heidrick and Struggles, is writing for an audience of employers or prospective employers of women executives. The book examines both general issues (e.g., how to make affirmative action effective; considerations in seeking candidates inside the corporation and outside; the effects on the business world of equal opportunity for women) and practical questions (interviewing "do's" and "don'ts"; selecting an outside recruiter). A particularly useful chapter, "Where to Position Women Executives," discusses how to eliminate "women's jobs" and how to encourage success in the initial placement of a woman manager in the organization by carefully assessing level, function, and location. McLane suggests that a corporation can take the following steps to help assure the integration of a woman in the management ranks: a careful match of the manager to the job's requirements; placement in a substantive position with meaningful responsibilities, not a post created for the occasion; clear performance measures; and the company's commitment to providing the support that the woman manager will need if she is to succeed.[43]

The importance of supportive measures is a theme in the work of other writers analyzing the factors contributing to successful corporate experiences. Woodworth and Woodworth describe the components of an effective organizational strategy to deal with women in management. They emphasize that one of the necessary supports for success is a boss who (a) helps women subordinates design programs of career development; (b)

49

facilitates plans for the achievement of concrete goals; and (c) provides constructive feedback on performance."[44] The signs of a corporation's support for a woman manager are often conveyed subtly; this endorsement (or lack of it) may determine the potential for success in a situation. *Business Week* reports that companies are learning that:

> to install a female in a management position while simultaneously withdrawing the trappings of power or signaling that her position has lower prestige is a situation designed for failure. It not only cripples the woman but her subordinates and superiors as well. More and more companies today have learned how to clear the way for qualified women to success as bosses."[45]

Other studies have advocated specific procedures as part of programs to equalize women's job opportunities: job posting; the maintenance of high-quality promotion and transfer lists of possible female candidates; and providing incentives to first-line managers responsible for implementing affirmative action objectives."[46]

What has been the impact of affirmative action programs on the corporate organization? The Shaeffer study observes that, due to equal employment opportunity concerns, corporations have reassessed personnel practices and policies and made changes of real value to all company employees and to management. Outmoded or unnecessary procedures have been modified or eliminated; personnel policies and practices have been standardized and made widely known; centralized planning and monitoring of these policies and procedures on a quantitative basis have been expanded."[47]

This improvement in the utilization of human resources has resulted in an increase in the workload of the personnel department and a change in the nature of its relationship to the rest of the organization. The introduction of sophisticated staffing systems and flow-based models of human resources requires a professional, managerially-oriented personnel staff. The personnel officer is becoming as influential to top-management decision-making as are the officers in charge of financial and physical asset flows within the organization. The position of the personnel department if strengthened because of its direct connection to the bottom line through losses that might be incurred through ineffective policies, as well as through gains that might be accrued through new procedures. Overall, better management of staffing systems results in "more stable, more productive, and more satisfied executive forces."[48]

Woodworth and Woodworth summarize the benefits to the company from efforts to improve job opportunities for women:

> As we see it, corporate response to the dramatic entry of women into the market place is no longer a matter of social responsibility, of hiring out of a sense of community need or to comply with federal mandates. Rather the issue is one of maximizing the

utilization of women's abilities in pursuit of business excellence. In the end, such a practice is just good capitalism."

NOTES

[1]Rosen and Jerdee, "Effects of Applicant's Sex"; Rosen and Jerdee, "Influence of Sex Role Stereotypes on Personnel Decisions"; Terborg and Ilgen, "A Theoretical Approach to Sex Discrimination in Traditionally Masculine Occupations."

[2]Rosen and Jerdee, "Sex Stereotyping in the Executive Suite."

[3]Hobart and Harries, "Sex-Role Stereotyping Among Future Managers."

[4]U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Money Income of Families and Persons in the U.S.: 1978*, pp. 244-46.

[5]U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, *The Earnings Gap Between Women and Men*, Table 5.

[6]Harlan and Jelinek, "Women in Management: A Study of Graduates of the Harvard Business School."

[7]Badavas, Baker, Dawson, Gorman and Kreter, "An Analysis of the Starting Salaries for Tuck MBA's for the Years 1977-78."

[8]"AMBA-Zehnder MBA Survey Charts International Career and Salary Trends," pp. 3, 12-15.

[9]*Ibid.*, p. 14.

[10]See, e.g., Levitin, Quinn and Staines, "Sex Discrimination Against the American Working Woman," and Staines, Quinn and Shepard, "Trends in Occupational Sex Discrimination: 1969-1973." These studies used samples of 1500 working men and women across a wide range of occupations.

[11]Larwood and Wood, *Women in Management*, pp. 11-12.

[12]Joslow, "Salary Survey 1980."

[13]Peters, Terborg and Taynor, "Women as Managers Scale (WAMS)."

[14]Rosen and Jerdee, "The Psychological Basis for Sex Role Stereotypes: A Note on Terborg and Ilgen's Conclusions"; Garland and Price, "Attitudes Toward Women in Management"; Ilgen and Terborg, "Sex Discrimination and Sex-Role Stereotypes: Are They Synonomous? No!"

[15]Terborg, Peters, Ilgen and Smith, "Organizational and Personal Correlates of Attitudes Toward Women as Managers."

[16]Herbert and Yost, "Faking Study of Scores on the Women as Managers Scale."

[17]Cohen and Leavengood, "The Utility of the WAMS: Shouldn't it Relate to Discriminatory Behavior?" Quote, p. 746.

[18]Rosen and Jerdee, "Effects of Applicant's Sex"; Hamner, Kim, Baird and Bigoness, "Race and Sex as Determinants of Ratings by Potential Employers." Also see Bigoness, "Effect of Applicant's Sex, Race, and Performance on Employer's Performance Ratings."

[19]Terborg and Ilgen, "A Theoretical Approach to Sex Discrimination in Traditionally Masculine Occupations"; Rosen and Jerdee, "Sex Stereotyping in the Executive Suite."

[20]Studies summarized in Osborn and Vicars, "Sex Stereotypes: An Artifact in Leader Behavior and Subordinate Satisfaction Analysis." Especially see Martin, "Support for Women's Lib: Management Performance." See also Chapman, "Comparisons of Male and Female Leadership Style."

[31]Osborn and Vicars, "Sex Stereotypes: An Artifact in Leader Behavior and Subordinate Satisfaction Analysis." This study deals with managers in mental health organizations, not in corporations. For a summary of studies, see Terborg, "Women in Management: A Research Review."

[32]Bartol, "The Sex Structuring of Organizations." Quote, p. 812.

[33]Bedeian, Armenakis and Kemp, "Relation of Sex to Perceived Legitimacy of Organizational Influence." For examples of management theories presenting the contingency management style, see the writings of Fred Fiedler, Paul Hershey and Kenneth Blanchard.

[34]Shaeffer and Lynton, *Corporate Experiences in Improving Women's Job Opportunities;* Shaeffer and Axel, *Improving Job Opportunities for Women.*

[35]Shaeffer and Lynton, *Corporate Experiences in Improving Women's Job Opportunities,* p. ii.

[36]*Ibid.*, p. 9.

[37]*Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

[38]*Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

[39]*Ibid.*, p. 11.

[40]*Ibid.*, p. 13. Underlining added.

[41]Shepherd and Levin, "Managerial Discrimination in Large Firms." Quote, p. 417.

[42]For further information, see Northrup and Larson, *The Impact of the A.T.&T.-EEO Consent Decree.*

[43]Robert E. Beck, Speech (New York: Conference Board meeting, June 4, 1979).

[44]Barnhill-Hayes, *Employer Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action,* p. 2. For a comparison of the attitudes and programs of Canadian businessmen, see S. Van der Merwe, "Women as Managers."

[45]*Ibid.*, pp. 19-20, 9.

[46]*Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

[47]*Ibid.*, pp. 2[illegible]-32.

[48]*Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

[49]*Ibid.*, p. 6.

[50]Shaeffer and Lynton, *Corporate Experiences in Improving Women's Job Opportunities,* pp. 45-55. More sophisticated and vigorous means of determining true availability are also now available, e.g., B.W. Fragner's formulae. See Fragner, "Affirmative Action Through Hiring and Promotion."

[51]Churchill, "Analyzing and Modeling Human Resource Flows," p. 23.

[52]See, e.g., Rosenbaum, "Career Paths and Advancement Opportunities."

[53]McLane, *Selecting, Developing and Retaining Women Executives, pp. 58-80.*

[54]Woodworth and Woodworth, "The Female Takeover: Threat or Opportunity," pp. 23-24.

[55]"How Men Adjust to a Female Boss," p. 94.

[56]Norgaard, "Problems and Perspectives of Female Managers," p. 25; Shaeffer and Lynton, *Corporate Experiences in Improving Women's Job Opportunities,* pp. 35, 38-40; Harlan and Weiss, *Moving Up: Women in Managerial Careers;* McLane, *Selecting, Developing and Retaining Women Executives,* p. 28.

[45]Shaeffer and Lynton, *Corporate Experiences in Improving Women's Job Opportunities*, pp. 27-30. For an anlysis of the impact of equal opportunity legislation on personnel practices affecting women, see Farley, *Affirmative Action and the Woman Worker*.

[46]Churchill, "Analyzing and Modeling Human Resource Flows," pp. 19-20; Shaeffer and Lynton, *Corporate Experiences in Improving Women's Job Opportunities*, pp. 29-30; R.G. Shaeffer, *Staffing Systems*, quote. p. i; A.R. Janger, *The Personnel Function*.

[47]Woodworth and Woodworth, "The Female Takeover: Threat or Opportunity," p. 28.

SECTION VII

Career Development of Women Managers

Advice Books for Aspiring Women Executives

Counseling women on how to achieve executive positions has become a popular journalistic aspect of this field, as well as a profitable industry in its own right: how to be a manager, how to be more assertive, how to develop coping strategies, how to communicate in the informal language of the organization. At their best, recent publications on managerial behavior and style offer insights into corporate politics; the sports and sex-related jargon of businessmen; and the symbolism of office design. At their worst, these guides gives the impression that women will progress if they can avoid the sexual advances of business colleagues and that if women know how to dress for success, they can ride into the executive suite on a clotheshorse.[1]

There are now available a large number of books to advise striving women executives on a wide range of issues. Among the most useful and readable are those discussed below, written between 1977 and 1980. The advances and changes in tone and sophistication are remarkable in such a short periof of time.

Betty Harragan's *Games Mother Never Taught You: Corporate Gamesmanship for Women,* acclaimed when published in 1977 and widely quoted today, is an insightful book about women's adjustment to the games of corporate politics. As detailed by Harragan, the corporate structure is descended from the military, which is a hierarchical pyramid of defined, ascending ranks in a chain of command, functioning within prescribed rules of protocol, known and observed by all members. Because few American women have had any military experience, or any experience in organized sports which are similarly structured, Harragan states that women are not socialized, as men are, to play and win on a business team. The text describes men's love of the game; how they play, win, and lose; and suggests tactics women must learn in order to be winners. Sports catchphrases such as "Never talk back to the coach," "Keep your eye on the ball," and "You can't win 'em all" might seem hackneyed now when applied to business, but the anlogies were fresh and pertinent when first presented. Even Harragan's basic definition of a team — "a group of individuals in the same rank, each with clear-cut duties and responsibilities, who act in a harmonious and reciprocal relationship to each other to further a mutual goal" — is food for thought.

Harragan provides general advice on avoiding job traps, using feminist placement firms, and broadening one's life experience through travel and a

wide range of friendships. The tactics described for a job interview (e.g., fending off outrageous questions) and for gaining the serious attention and respect of bosses and colleagues are worth the price of the book. The final aspect of the game is realizing that money is the scorecard — women must focus on salary, raises, and promotions and perks which correspond to the higher managerial positions they seek.[2]

The New Executive Woman by M.G. Williams is a practical guidebook, or survival manual, with recommendations on managing subordinates, handling pressure, dealing with male chauvinism, and dressing for success. Writing in 1977, Williams describes the executive woman as a feminist in principle, but an individualist in practice. Misconceptions about women, stereotypical non-thinking, are described at length, and women are advised how to respond to or counter these ideas by learning to use femininity appropriately. Much of this book seems old-fashioned today; although it may benefit the older woman in middle-management, much of the material is available in stronger words and more useful form elsewhere.[3]

A chatty book with Southern charm, *Boss Lady: An Executive Woman Talks About Making It* by Jo Foxworth, could be enjoyable reading on the bedside table. The advice, not new or startling, is the self-acquired wisdom of the author who is the chief executive officer of her own advertising company. How to package yourself, (tips on dress and speech and drinking) and what not to tell (your age, your salary, the story of your sex life) are presented in a homey good-natured style that also packs a punch. Some practical suggestions are included for the homemaker who might be setting out into the business world.[4] The pitfalls ambitious women encounter are the subject of another, new publication by Foxworth, *Wising Up: The Mistakes Women Make in Business and How to Avoid Them.*[5]

Margaret Fenn's book, *Making it in Management,* starts with a descriptive analysis of the psychological, social, and organizational barriers hindering women's advancement in business. Chapters on management functions and on relations with subordinates, peers, and superiors focus on the question of learned behavior appropriate to different situations. Leadership, defined as the behavior and interaction between the leader and those led, is effective when the style complements the personal predispositions of the leader, the abilities of those led, and the requirements of the particular situation. Fenn stresses that decisiveness, needed by top management, can be learned. She discusses three approaches to decision-making (intuitive, judgmental, and problem-solving) and emphasizes the steps toward effective problem-solving when acting as an individual or as a member of a group.[6]

In *The Effective Women Manager,* Nathaniel Stewart advises women in their first managerial job how to prepare themselves for future advancement. Stewart isolates seven skills which are vital to the success of a woman manager: planning, coordination, delegation, evaluation, problem-solving, developing subordinates, and time allocation. Stewart believes women have frequently been denied the access to develop these skills. For

example, proficiency in planning requires experience, but women in offices are often limited to simple, short-range activities with few chances to formulate and carry out broad plans. Stewart does an excellent job of explaining how individual women can develop these capacities and what measures the company can undertake to provide the appropriate climate for growth.[7]

Some of the most promising and immediately useable strategies for businesswomen are presented in Joan Koob Cannie's *The Woman's Guide to Management Success: How to Win Power in the Real Organizational World.* Although the first part of the book may be somewhat simplistic for women established in their career paths, the sections on verbal-skill strategies explain clever techniques to improve communication and to gain control of a situation. Cannie describes and provides exercise to develop the skills of listening, attending (showing others physically and psychologically that we are paying attention to them); stroking (giving a person verbal attention or respect); and reflection (repeating back the content and meaning of another person's comments). Negotiating and persuading are given new dimensions by Cannie's advocacy of the techniques of the "tentative phrase," understanding the case, and contracting.[8]

B.S. Grieff and P.K. Munter's *Tradeoffs: Executive, Family and Organizational Life,* like most of the advice books, looks as if it was written on note cards, shuffled, then held together by subheads. Among questions discussed are: major transitions in executive careers; reasons successful executives should change jobs; and tradeoffs among executive, family, and organizational aspects of life. Although a coherent scheme is lacking, this book is significant among the advice literature; it is imbued with the sense that both men and women can be and are executives. Although the volume discusses subjects such as women traveling on business, it is not written particularly for women managers, but it is not written for male managers either. If this 1980 publication is an example of an emerging style of business advice for men *or* women, then it is a very hopeful sign.[9]

Lois Hart's *Moving Up! Women and Leadership,* an outgrowth of a women's leadership training course, could be used as a self-assessment course for executive success. Generally, it advises women who have set themselves the goal of executive leadership to be true to themselves and to be androgynous in skills and business behavior. There is a chapter on each of seven defined dimensions of leadership: communications, human relations, counseling, supervision, management science, decision making, and planning. A check list for assessment of requisite skills begins each chapter, followed by discussion of the particular skills, their importance in specific situations, and methods for improving them. In the communications section, for example, specific groundrules for giving positive and negative feedback are outlined, as well as guidelines for responding to both types of feedback effectively. There are exercises for learning, for listening, for practicing; as well as charts, planning sheets, and tests; all are directed toward enhanced self-confidence, increased awareness, and mastery of a variety of leadership tactics.

Hart discusses the skills necessary for different positions and situations. For example, planning a meeting is analyzed in detail with advice presented on the task and maintenance roles required, including inviting participants, preparing an agenda, bringing the group to a decision by vote or consensus, and presiding so as to attain the desired goal of the meeting. Although this book is more practical in the actual mechanics of business leadership, much of the advice is elementary. However, the format is quite useable and puts into straightforward language some effective tactics that otherwise might take years of experience to learn. A bibliography of self-help resources and a list of over 90 professional women's groups appear at the end.[10]

Inspired by a strong sense of women's responsibility to other women, Natasha Josefowitz has written a forceful book about how women can empower themselves with self-knowledge and knowledge of the work world in order to succeed in the male-dominated business community. *Paths to Power; A Woman's Guide From First Job to Top Executive* explores both issues particular to women, such as assertion and multicommitments, and issues pertinent to the organization, such as sponsoring, organizational development, and conflict management.

The path to power starts with solid *preparation* — assessment of current skills, the job hunt, the resume, the interview. Pointers for success and pitfalls to avoid are given in the text and in two detailed appendices on preparing the resume and the cover letter. The *"moving in"* phase requires attention to the behavioral norms of the organization. After ascertaining what the "norms" are, women must decide which to follow, which may be in conflict with their personal norms, and how to resolve the conflicts. Women must take risks at this stage, as at others, to be recognized as competent. They should learn the organization chart, recognize the positions and symbols of power, and size up the informal power structure.

The *"settling down"* phase, with thoughts of moving up, requires an understanding of the controlling forces in the organization, mastering new general and specific skills, using politics, and overcoming inhibitory nonassertion. Crucial to this stage of development are techniques to make the most effective use of the resources of information, time, and territory. Here, "assertion at the place of work takes the form of *expressing, requesting,* or *refusing* around the three categories of *role, task,* and *resources.*" A list of guidelines for supervisors precedes information on how to plan, schedule, train, motivate, and evaluate subordinates. A detailed interview guide is presented, with tips on hiring and firing.

Josefowitz believes that the multicommitted woman faces particular problems in balancing career and family obligations. Age and family situation dictate a woman's options much more than the choices available to men. Both practical and emotional responsibility for home and child-rearing tasks must be shared, according to Josefowitz, if the woman is to gain free time for her career and for her private personal development. An appendix on assessing commitments and planning alternative choices is included in the appendices.

Paths to Power identifies the personal skills required in the *manager phase:* self-knowledge, risk-taking, decision making, time management, and stress management. Time robbers and how to avoid them are a topic of interest, as is the avoidance of stress through organization, careful scheduling, and use of support systems. The strategy of mystery — of being a bit aloof and formal — is a power ploy useful to the *middle manager.* At this career phase a woman should have developed a managerial style which projects who she is, what she wants, what she will give, and what she expects to receive from others. Group dynamics are discussed at length, from the perspective of participant and that of leader.

Becoming CEO requires determination, confidence, energy, support, and instances of luck along the way. Studies cited by Josefowitz have found that people who are highest in both masculine and feminine traits (as traditionally expressed) are the most effective managers. The profile of the successful professional woman includes strength, the ability to think in organizational terms, and a commitment to improve the work environment for all. Josefowitz's thoughtful treatise even describes a final career phase — planning for retirement, or planning to "re-tire" for a new career at the close of a prime-of-life one. Throughout, Josefowitz, contends that women's needs for affiliation, interest in people concerns, and high value orientation are of inestimable value to the business world, and she encourages women to incorporate these qualities as aspects of their power in the world of business.[11]

A final word should be added about the contributions of the popular press to the advice literature available to aspiring women managers. The cause of equalizing women's job opportunities has been greatly advanced by the rise of a group of magazines which present a new and vital image of career women. This genre, working women magazines, includes *Savvy, Working Mother, Working Woman,* and a newsletter, the *Executive Woman.*

Savvy is published monthly, with a circulation of around 250,000. This magazine projects itself as a publication dedicated exclusively to the executive woman and the woman with executive aspirations. Regular columns feature articles on health, fashion, and psychological issues. The emphasis is on the business of business. Successful women are profiled; advice on how to deal with employees is offered. Career training and opportunities are all discussed in a glossy and sophisticated format.[12]

Of the periodicals aimed at this market, *Working Mother* probably has the largest potentional for high circulation. It currently has a readership of about 300,00. Columns are devoted to childrearing, career advice, and ideas to resolve conflicts between family and career responsibilities.[13]

Working Woman, a monthly with a circulation of 400,000, is the most widely-read of these magazines. Although the publication was aimed at a general audience when it began, *Working Woman* has increasingly concentrated on women managers and professionals and women aspiring to those positions. A special aspect of the journal is the reports on current research,

e.g., in management studies, and the interpretation of these findings into practical applications of possible users to readers.[14]

The Executive Woman, published bi-monthly by the National Association for Female Executives with a membership of 38,000, describes itself as a "newsletter for women in business." The periodical features profiles of successful businesswomen, legal and business advice, information on relevant publications, and a column which reports on recent promotions received by women in a variety of occupations.[15]

These periodicals, especially *Savvy* and *Working Woman,* present a consistent image of the successful businesswoman as intelligent, attractive, sophisticated, and creative. Perhaps more than the concrete advice in the guidebooks, this portrayal of the career woman could have substantial impact on the opportunities of women in business. These media images can encourage the aspirations of young women, make their career goals more broadly acceptable in U.S. society, and present a model in which success, self-satisfaction, responsibility, and femininity are compatible.

Mentors and Networks: New Strategies or New Rationalizations?

One of the most common motifs in the career advice literature is the necessity of mentors and networks for the advancement of women professionals. When considered within the context of the corporation as an organizational structure, these currently fashionable subjects can gain a much-needed theoretical depth by reference to the dynamics of the organizational environment, especially to issues such as access to the power structure. However, limitations to their usefulness and possible counterproductive effects are also evident.

Role models, sponsors, and mentors are similar concepts to describe a helping/modeling relationship, but they are used in different fields to refer to different stages of an individual's development. Studies of role models have focused primarily on young children and their parental models and on teachers as role models for high school and college students. Jeanne J. Speizer reviews this role model research and reports that these studies have yielded contradictory and variable results concerning the importance of strong identification with a role model, the importance of the sex of a role model, and the specific functions of a role model. Identification and modeling have not been studied systematically. Researchers focusing on role models have assumed the validity of the concept and designed their studies to "determine what occurs to a person who can identify a role model."[16]

These same limitations in methodology and in evidence apply to the discussion of sponsors and mentors. These two terms are often used interchangeably. However, the term "sponsor" was more in vogue in the 1960s and into \$970 and appears to have been now replaced by "mentor," which

is preferred when the term is applied in a business context. As defined by Speizer, these concepts describe "an older person in an organization who takes a younger colleague under his/her wing and supports that person's career progress until she or he is about 40."[17] R.M. Kanter describes a mentor as one who provides power to "fast-track" younger careerists by (a) being in a position to fight for the protogee, (b) helping the person bypass the hierarchy, and (c) providing reflected power.[18]

In their early work, *The Managerial Woman,* Hennig and Jardim profiled 25 high-level women executives and reported that early in their careers, each woman had a male mentor who was "her supporter, her encourager, her teacher and her strength in the company."[19] More recently, articles in professional journals and popular magazines have elaborated so extensively on this subject that one might reach the conclusion of a recent article in the *Harvard Business Review:* "Everyone Who Makes It Has a Mentor."[20] According to the recent literature, finding a mentor is important if an aspiring manager wishes to reach the top at a young age, earn more money, achieve satisfaction with career progress, and be a leader.[21]

J. Thompson declares "Patrons, Rabbis, Mentors — Whatever You Call Them, Women Need Them, Too." Thompson cites the importance of a mentor for successful women, particularly in the large corporation, and counsels productive women to seek the psychological and tactical support of a mentor who is receptive to the objective evaluation of excellent performance. Women interviewed for this article stress that merit got them their sponsor; their sponsor got them their promotion.[22] In *Moving Up! Women and Leadership,* L.B. Hart strongly advocates mentoring, and counsels on how to identify a mentor, what to expect, when to leave a mentoring relationship, and how to embrace a commitment to become a mentor for others.[23]

Phillips sees mentoring as one valuable component of an overall career development plan. In the Phillips survey, 61 percent of the women executives stated that they had had one or more primary or secondary mentors, including supportive bosses/partners, corporate sponsors, professional mentors, peer strategizers, career role models, and favor-doers. In this study, different mentors were reported to have provided encouragement, teaching, opportunities, help with career moves, visibility, and exposure to power and excitement.[24]

Much of the recent popularity of the mentor concept has been based on D.J. Levinson's work on the stages of adult development. Levinson studied the lives of 40 men, ages 35-45, from a wide range of occupations and concludes that a universal theme in their experiences was the *need* for a mentor. Levinson observes that his definition of a mentor relationship cannot be used for women because his subjects were all men, and as he states, "one of the great problems of women is that female mentors are scarce, especially in the world of work. The few women who might serve as mentors are often too beset by the stresses of surviving in a work world dominated by men to provide good mentoring for women."[25]

Levinson's idea about the need for mentors has caught the interest of other investigators who have designed surveys which conclude that successful executives have had and have been sponsors and that women need to cultivate mentors.[26] However, as Speizer points out, Levinson's analysis actually provides little information or solid evidence to support his theory that men need a mentor. Speizer also criticizes the few attempts at systematic studies of mentors because they have been flawed by methodological problems: numbers of subjects have been too small to permit valid generalizations; much of the information collected is retrospective; and the very concept of mentor still needs further clarification.[27]

An extension or variation of the sponsor/mentor argument, one that encourages broader support groups, is articulated today through advocacy of the concept of networking. Carol Kleiman — in a book with an explicative subtitle, *Women's Networks: The Complete Guide to Getting a Better Job, Advancing Your Career and Feeling Great As A Woman Through Networking* — argues that informal support groups or "networks" are a vital means for women to achieve success in business. The purpose of such networks is "to exchange relevant career information, to provide support for problem solving, and to help develop skills and a sense of professionalism." Kleiman discusses the operation of existing networks for women, explains how to set up your own group, and lists 1400 national, state, and local networks formed around a variety of special interests including women in business.[28]

There are a number of research projects underway, aimed at a clearer assessment of how and why a network operates. Most of these studies in process are focusing on women in higher education administration, such as the project of M.E. Capek et al.[29] However, the Business and Professional Women's Foundation is involved in two studies in the business field. In one, BPW funded a dissertation by C. Farah, exploring the "Importance of Support Systems for Male and Female Managers." By analysis of the survey results of 600 male and female bank managers, Farah is examining whether female bank managers are expected to perform at high levels but are hampered by subtle forms of discrimination, such as being excluded from existing networks.[30] In another project, BPW's staff is conducting a project on women in an employment network. After first identifying women's networks across the country, the BPW staff is conducting an in-depth study of a woman's network in a major corporate headquarters in New York City. This in-house network comprising of 500 women, is authorized and supported by the company.[31]

According to A.K. Daniels, women in traditionally male professions, such as management, science, and engineering, are setting up feminist networks to parallel the existing "old-boy networks." These feminist networks reinforce a sense of self-worth, serve as intra-referral systems for job changes, and "supply the professional and personal support structure to dilute or negate the indifference or hostility many women face when operating in a man's world." Daniels believes the use of networks to gain

advantage through information and contacts should not be seen as "somehow immoral or illegal." Such informal channels are often necessary even "to move the cumbersome machinery of an insider's own bureaucratic administration."[13]

Several generations of working women are now available in the executive pool and in feminist networks today, so that only now older women might be beginning to see an obligation to offer general advice and specific career counseling to younger women. The concepts of networks and mentors can be interconnected to encompass broad, cross-generational, multilevel advisory/support roles by a *spectrum* of individuals who facilitate entry and advancement for their proteges. Shapiro et al. call this system of professional sponsorship the "patron system." They suggest that advisory/guiding personae form a continuum, with mentors and "peer pals" as end points and sponsors and "guides" as internal points on this continuum.[13]

In spite of the widespread acceptance of the importance of mentors and networks, are these actually effective new strategies for women in business, or merely the latest rationalization to explain the limited mobility of women in business? Speizer declares that the contemporary use of role models, mentors, and sponsors is not sustained by research and is based on belief without evidence. She warns:

> There is a chance that dependence on the concepts as appropriate vehicles for career preparation and advancement might, in fact, work to the detriment of women and minorities. If one must have a role model or mentor like oneself, it will be some time before there are sufficient and appropriate people to play such roles. In the meantime, the lack of proper role models or mentors might be used to justify such gestures as doing nothing, hiring tokens alone, or not hiring women and minorities on the assumption that the lack of models and mentors will assure their failure.[14]

Speizer fears that the popularity of the mentor concept tends to reinforce the male-dominated organizational status quo — it appears easier to focus on the rather vague promises of individual mentor relationships, than to concentrate on increasing the number of women to a point which would portend a real change in power and control within the corporate environment.[16] Moreover, the crucial issue in the case of professional women's networks still persists: can the informal, pre-existent conditions found in most male groups which contribute to their acquisition of power be recreated formally for women?

However, even if businesswomen's networks cannot operate with the ease, elegance, and advantage that result from pre-existing conditions in male networks, there is no doubt that they can be of some use, especially in a job market where, as the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics shows, almost half — 48 percent — of all jobs come through personal contacts. This figure is probably even higher for management, where the higher one goes

on the executive ladder, the more the positions are filled by word-of-mouth.[16] Also, coalition formation is possibly more important for women executives than the female leaders in other fields because business does not have the numerous regional and national professional associations common in, e.g., higher education. Even more than women in other fields, high-level corporate women have problems (and possibilities) peculiar to the uniqueness of their position in a male-stereotyped field and their presence as the "tokens" to equal rights. Carol Kleiman comments on the usefulness of networks in such a situation:

> Women, one by one, are getting more responsible jobs, and their tasks and the weight of what they do hang heavier on them just because they *are* women. Because they are "token," it isn't politic for them to show any doubts or confusion, as a man in the same position might do. These women, then, are spearheading the formation of business and professional networks throughout the United States. By joining forces with one another, they give and get mutual support and also provide the climate for more women to enter management.[17]

NOTES

[1]For slightly earlier, but still useful, guidebooks, see Higginson and Quick, *The Ambitious Woman's Guide to a Successful Career* and Place and Armstrong, *Management Careers for Women*. For a comparison over twenty years of the changes and similarities in advice, see Maule, *Executive Careers for Women* (1957). For an example of the absurd in advice literature, see Houston, "Businesswomanly Wiles: A Few Rules on Disarming the Skeptics."

[2]Harragan, *Games Mother Never Taught You*. Quote, p. 68.

[3]Williams, *The New Executive Woman*.

[4]Foxworth, *Boss Lady*.

[5]Foxworth, *Wising Up*.

[6]Fenn, *Making It In Management*.

[7]Stewart, *The Effective Woman Manager*.

[8]Cannie, *The Woman's Guide to Management Success*.

[9]Greiff and Munter, *Tradeoffs: Executive, Family and Organizational Life*.

[10]Hart, *Moving Up! Women and Leadership*.

[11]Josefowitz, *Paths to Power*. Quote, p. 35.

[12]*Savvy*. Savvy Company, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, New York.

[13]*Working Mother*, McCalls, 230 Park Avenue, New York, New York.

[14]*Working Woman*, Hal Publications Inc., 1180 6th Avenue, New York, New York.

[15]*Executive Woman*, National Association for Female Executives, 134 East 38th Street, New York, New York.

[16]Speizer, *Role Models, Mentors and Sponsors*. Quotes, p. 16.

[17]*Ibid.*, p. 20.

[18]Kanter, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, pp. 181-84.

[19]Hennig and Jardim, *The Managerial Woman*, pp. 126-36. Quote, p. 129. Although first published in 1976, this section of the book is based on Hennig's 1970 doctoral thesis.

[20]Collins and Scott, "Everyone Who Makes it Has a Mentor."

[21]See, e.g., Merkin, "Choosing a Mentor"; Zaleznik, "Managers and Leaders: Are They Different?"; Roche, "Probing Opinions."

[22]Thompson, "Patrons, Rabbis, Mentors — Whatever You Call Them, Women Need Them, Too."

[23]Hart, *Moving Up! Women and Leadership*, pp. 201-204.

Phillips, "Mentors and Proteges."

[24]D.J. Levinson, et al., *The Season's of a Man's Life* (New York: Knopf, 1978). Quote, p. 98. Cited in Speizer, p. 22.

[25]See, e.g., Roche, "Probing Opinions."

[26]Speizer, *Role Models, Mentors and Sponsors*, pp. 23-25.

[27]Kleiman, *Women's Networks: The Complete Guide*. Quote, p. 14.

[28]M.E. Capek, J. Beniger, C. Black, H. Hollander, and L. Savory, "Careers and Contacts: A Study of Networks and Career Patterns in Higher Education Administration." Research in progress — Center for Continuing Education, Princeton University.

[29]Farah, "The Importance of Support Systems for Male and Female Managers."

[30]Business and Professional Women's Foundation, "Women in an Employment Network."

[31]Daniels, "Development of Feminist Networks in the Professions." Quotes, pp. 219, 215.

[32]Shapiro, Haseltine and Rowe, "Moving Up: Role Models, Mentors, and the 'Patron System'."

[33]Speizer, *Role Models, Mentors and Sponsors*, p. 25.

[34]*Ibid.*, p. 20.

[35]Kleiman, *Women's Networks: The Complete Guide*, p. 2.

[36]*Ibid.*, p. 15.

Profile of the Successful Woman Manager. Comparison of Male and Female Managers: "A Significant Case of No Significant Difference?"

Several wide-ranging group studies of women in managerial positions have been published during the past few years.[1] Many of the earlier studies were inadequate because of poor research designs and limited samples which were not well distributed among managers in diverse field situations. As the number of women managers at all levels of business increases, there is an acute need for more research analyzing their personalities, social backgrounds, and career pathways.

One of the most significant sources of recent information on managerial women is the data obtained annually by Heidrick and Struggles, Inc., the executive search firm. Published as *Profile of a Woman Officer,* these reports present findings on executive women holding officer rank at the corporate level in America's 1300 largest organizations. Heidrick and Struggles define their profile:

> The typical woman officer of 1979 is married, under 50 years of age, has at least one degree, was born into a family of low or middle income, and has compensation of less than $40,000 from her non-industrial employment. She is younger, more highly educated, and better compensated than her counterparts of earlier studies.[2]

The scope of these reports does much to broaden the base for realistic discussions of women's current place in the business world: she is ahead of where she has been in the past, but not so far ahead as she would like to be. According to a recent study of 100 Canadian managers: "[They] are, in fact, looking for approval, challenge, and an opportunity to move into higher ranks of management, involvement and decision-making in their companies."[3]

While compilations from questionnaires surveying large numbers of women managers provide a picture of the typical woman corporate officer, studies focusing on fewer women in greater depth help to "flesh out" her total personality in professional and personal aspects. In the recent literature, there are a number of interesting journalistic accounts, including *Making It* by Ruth Halcomb and *Women on Top* by Jane Adams, which bridge the gap between statistical works and individual case histories.[4]

Because of differences in business practice and opinions caused by line of business, geography, and company size, business historians have recognized the invalidity of extrapolating from a few cases to the whole

business "community." Researchers on women in management have only recently begun to observe that the experience of a woman manager can be affected by certain situational variables. For instance, when corporate size is examined, investigators report that while larger firms may employ more women in management, small firms may offer women a better chance to achieve *top* management positions.[5]

As Table VII indicates, the percentage of women managers has been the largest in four industry groups: retail trade, banking, insurance, and communications. The 1975 data shows an increase in the percentage of women managers in all industries charted, except utilities, with significant advancement for women managers in the banking and communications industries.

TABLE VII

Representation Within Industry Groups: Percentage of All Managers who are Female[6]

Industry Group	Percent Female Managers 1970	1975
Retail Trade	21%	24%
Banking	19%	29%
Insurance	17%	18%
Communications	15%	27%
Transportation	9%	11%
Nondurable goods manufacturing	9%	10%
Durable goods manufacturing	5%	6%
Electric and gas utilities	4%	3%

In reviewing the statistics, the group studies, and the journalistic accounts, it is apparent that the profile of the successful woman executive is similar to, yet different from, the profile of the male executive. The similarities involve the manner in which female managers relate to their jobs, while the differences concern family life. Ritchie and Boehm developed a scoreable biographical data key to determine the validity of using biographical data from lower-level management men and women to predict individual management potential. The results of their study indicate that "the same types of life experiences are predictive of subsequent managerial success for college-educated women and men."[7]

Findings show almost all female executives are pleased with their jobs, work more than 40 hours a week, enjoy their success, and hold the same expectations of their positions as male managers. The reasons women give for being satisfied with their executive jobs are similar to those given by men: they like solving problems, using their talents, and managing others.[8] Suc-

cessful women managers seem to enjoy the rewards of success. While goals of men such as money, power, recognition, influence, respect, and prestige are sought after, women place great significance on achieving independence and integration of their personal and professional lives.[9] The limited research on attitudes and motives of individuals in management careers indicates that "women appear to manage well for essentially the same reasons men do — that is, existing criteria for excellence are equally appropriate for both." No consistent differences in motivation have been found between male and female managers.[10]

The composite image of the successful woman executive as drawn from the existing surveys seems to coincide with the standard profile of the successful executive: she is independent, tenacious, tough, ambitious, competitive, more assertive and self-confident than less successful women who appear to be "just working" rather than pursuing careers. When Knotts compared professional women workers with other adult women, she found that professional women have significant personality differences, as identified on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS). Women managers exhibit higher needs than adult women in general for heterosexuality, exhibition, dominance, and achievement, and lower needs than the normative group for order, affiliation, succorance, abasement, and nurturance.[11]

Although the research is scant and relatively new, the one job-related area in which women do seem to differ from men concerns their perception of self in a professional situation. In a survey of 1500 women managers and enrollees in a mid-management course, A.S. Baron found that women were less likely to feel like a member of management than were males in a similar survey.[12] Women who felt they were getting the same type of job enrichment through training as their male counterparts tended to perceive themselves as upwardly mobile managers. However, one-fourth of the women believed that they were not getting the same type of management training and informal guidance as their male colleagues.

Despite similarities in their personality traits and motivations, men and women managers work under certain contingencies that are influenced by the small number of women employed in such positions. As noted by Mai-Dalton, both men and women in upper management work predominantly with male co-workers. As a result, women are relatively isolated from same-sex others in their work environment, while men are not.[13] This difference in *quantity* of women in management might be much more significant than the *quality* of individual women's performance.

The executive role does impose a more demanding schedule on the personal lives of women than of men. Although marriage has not been directly proven to slow career advancement, the women in these studies are only a third to a half as likely as male managers to be married. Compared with the general population, a substantially larger percentage of women in middle management are not married, and those who are married tend to marry late. Married female executives are less likely than their male

counterparts to have children, but, if they do, they have primary responsibility for their care and, therefore, spend more time with them than do married male executives. Many female middle managers either have no children or have older children who have already left home.[14] Although there does not yet exist solid statistical data to confirm this impression, there does seem to be a trend toward an increase in the marriage rate of younger women managers.

Researchers have never thoroughly examined why women managers would be less likely to be married than male managers or than women in the general population. It has been assumed that possible reasons include the extent of the dedication to the job, the degree of motivation, and the overall difficulty of combining domestic and career demands. However, some recent research would suggest that the lower marriage rates of the past may also be related to the kind of men with whom most women managers have contact at work and from whom they would be most likely to draw a marriage partner. Winter et al. report that "power-motivated" men, such as executives, prefer dependent wives and are less likely to accept the sharing of power that is implied in their wives having a career.[15] Surveys of women executives support the proposition that successful career women generally have supportive husbands with strong self-images who are not threatened by their wives' success.[16]

In the decision of career vs. marriage, timing is most important. Although in the past, and often today, women build careers after years of marriage and early child-rearing, there seems to be a trend toward launching a career first and marrying later.[17] Early career emphasis allows the woman to crystallize her self-image and to define her career goals, and facilitates the choice of a partner who will encourage her career after marriage. Where there is a lack of ambivalence felt by both partners toward the wife's career, there is an atmosphere of mutual career support which can be synergistic and enhance the career achievements of both spouses.[18] Successful women executives, professionally and in their married lives, describe their husbands as understanding, compassionate, liberal-minded, and highly intelligent. These men are often also successful, but all are at least extremely satisfied with their own working lives and secure in themselves. Studies reveal that men married to professional working women are more supportive of successful women in general, including preferring female bosses and seeking female professionals (e.g., when choosing a lawyer).[19]

Marital status and husband's attitude are *immediate* influences that may affect career patterns, but investigators have also focused on *antecedent* influences, i.e., certain aspects of early socialization that may shape the later work experience of women who become managers. The findings on these influences are equivocal: there is a discernible but restricted effect of a number of variables: (1) *Birth order position.* Women managers are typically first-born or an only child; they do not have an older brother.[20] (Heidrick and Struggles' findings do not support this.) (2) *Social class, occupation of father, and personal relationship to father.* According to

Gorden and Strober, women managers have a higher socioeconomic background than their male colleagues and are more likely to have had fathers in management. Schein and Hennig also found that women managers usually had fathers in management, but this hypothesis was not supported by Crawford's survey. As a young person, the female manager enjoyed a very close relationship with her father and identified with his occupational role. The feminine model of her mother, however, was never rejected.[21] (3) *Mother's work experience.* Results in testing this factor are inconsistent. The subjects in Crawford's study had working mothers who demonstrated how to combine the demands of home and an outside job. However, in Hennig's survey, the mothers did not work outside the home. This discrepancy can be explained by Fogarty's assertion that the influence on work patterns does not come from the variable of whether or not the mother worked, but from the mother's attitude toward her work situations, e.g., non-working mothers who were unhappy with their situation are associated with daughters who are more likely to work.[22]

Many aspects of this profile of the executive woman, especially the conclusions on antecedent influences, are open to question because the results have been reached in isolated, non-comparative studies. Are these patterns, such as birth order position, unique to *women* executives, or unique even to executives? In a comparison of matched pairs of employed executive and non-executive women, Morrison and Sebald reported no significant differences between the women in their early socialization process (e.g., father's occupation) or in their current marital environment. The study did find that in personal characteristics, the executive group was significantly higher in mental ability, the need for power, and the need for achievement.[23]

What aspects of the profile are affected by the *age* of the subjects? In future studies, researchers must give greater consideration to delineating generational differences among women surveyed, for there are actually three rather distinct age groups of female managers working today: senior executives over fifty, middle managers (about thirty-five to forty-five years of age), and managers under thirty-five. Many of the senior executives in the studies of Hennig and Crawford started their careers in an office-related position, such as secretary.[24] Many women of this generation came into business through opportunities created by World War II, then achieved their success through "what appeared to be a mixture of sheer excellence, great staying power, considerable expertise in their jobs, and the fact that certain men in key positions had been prepared to fight for their promotion."[25] They were often isolated, but pleased with their success.

The generation of managers who are thirty-five to forty-five years of age are old enough to have reached managerial positions through other than secretarial routes, but young enough to be still involved with the problems of combining heavy family demands with the demands of their careers. This generation seems more subject to what they consider to be discrimination against them in the promotion race. The generation of

managers under thirty-five, on the other hand, have often entered the business world via the same paths as their male colleagues. Recent increases in the enrollment of women in business courses in colleges and graduate schools are producing better-educated women, many with MBAs, who now enter managerial training programs in corporations. These female managers were raised in a totally different social climate; their access to jobs is different, and their attitudes are quite different from those of previous generations. They are much more confident of their own abilities, more ambitious, and more determined; they seem to be a lot more competitive, and are prepared to compete directly with their male colleagues in the corporate "games" necessary for promotion, rather than to accept only the positions in business where women have traditionally done well.[26] Moreover, in their pursuit of success, young female managers can turn to corporate role models and networks which were usually lacking for previous generations. Knowing these significant generational differences should induce researchers in the field of women managers to choose and identify the subjects of their studies quite carefully. If the youngest generation of women survive the deteriorating economic conditions, the profile of their careers and achievements twenty years from now may be quite different from their few female predecessors in the chief executive suite.

In assessing the image of the managerial woman as constructed from existing studies, it is important to realize that very little of the research has used female *and* male samples to establish the differential effects of early influences or to compare female *and* male managers in their psychological characteristics and organizational experiences. Several new studies and some research now underway have begun to use this comparative technique with startling results. In a current project, A. Harlan and C. Weiss are comparing a matched set of fifty male and fifty female managers employed in two retailing organizations in the same geographical area. Their major finding has been the striking degree of similarity between men and women managers:

> Men and women were found to have very similar psychological profiles of high power and achievement needs, high self-esteem, and high motivation to manage. In addition, both men and women experienced difficulty in understanding and planning their careers; obtaining balanced useful feedback; and obtaining opportunities for new skill development.[27]

After seeking sex-based differences which might be predictive of managerial success, Harlan and Weiss instead found considerable similarities. They explain the divergence of their findings from the conclusions of earlier studies:

> in retrospect, it appears women's experiences have been compared to a 'successful male myth' rather than to men's actual experiences. This myth, founded on sex stereotypes, assumes that

> men are: highly successful; have well planned careers; receive excellent training and development; have good working relationships with other company employees, . . . and encounter no problems on the road to top management, the position to which all men aspire . . . In fact, men and women encounter more similarities than differences in barriers to career advancement. The primary difference faced is the existence of sex bias . . . [28]

Harlan and Weiss urge that organizations can and should reduce the impact of this difference, sex bias, by investing in efforts aimed at total human resource development. Such programs should address the issues of affirmative action, selection and promotion criteria, and supervisory training and managerial development.[29]

Decision-making profiles of female and male managers also show great similarities, although slight differences in perceptions of difficulty, importance, and preference do exist. In an analysis of how male and female managers handled five types of business decisions, L.W. Humphreys and W.A. Schrode reported that women spent most time on task decisions, which are the easiest for them to make; followed by personnel decisions, which they prefer; then information decisions; then budgetary decisions, which they find most difficult and feel least important; with conceptual decisions, which they consider most important, taking the least amount of their time. Male managers also spent more of their time making task decisions; followed by information decisions, which are the easiest for them; personnel decisions, which they consider the most important; conceptual decisions, which they perceive as most difficult; with budgetary decisions, which are least preferred, requiring the least amount of their time. Although Humphreys and Schrode revealed more similarities than differences in the male and female decision-making profiles, the female managers in their study rated task decisions as most important, while the male managers considered personnel decisions most important. This finding contradicts the common notion that women are relationship-oriented and men task-oriented.[30]

In a 1980 study which compared the managerial behavior of nearly 2,000 male and female managers in a way designed to yield sex-based differences, Donnell and Hall found a "significant case of no significant difference." In this rigorous investigation, participants were carefully matched male/female according to age, rank in the organization, organizational type, and number of people supervised. Males and females in each sample were divided into high, average, and low achievement groups. Types of organizations included: science and technology, manufacturing, semi-public personnel, sales, finance, human services, and government — significantly broadening the range of investigation and giving increased validity to the overall findings. Five dimensions of managerial achievement were studied: managerial philosophy, motivational dynamics, participative practices, interpersonal competence, and managerial style. No significant overall differences between males and females were found in managerial

philosophy, in the motivational profiles of subordinates, in the management of their organization's technical and human resources, nor in the participative practices managers employed to obtain results from their subordinates.[31] In tests on forty-three different scales, Donnell and Hall detected only two overall differences between female and male managers. One pertained to interpersonal competence. Male managers were more open and candid in sharing relevant data with their colleagues. Subordinates also reported that they solicit — and receive — less feedback from female managers than did the subordinates of male managers.

The other difference found by Donnell and Hall favors females. The work motivation profiles of the female managers were more "achieving" than those of their male counterparts. Women reported lower basic needs than men for pay, work environment, and strain avoidance, and higher needs than men for self-actualization through opportunities for growth, autonomy, and challenge. More females than males reported that they were not so challenged by their jobs as they might be, nor as they would like to be.[32]

The striking similarities in male and female managerial achievement, however, led Donnell and Hall to conclude:

> Women, in general, do not differ from men, in general, in the ways in which they administer the management process . . . the disproportionately low numbers of women in management can no longer be explained away by the contention that women practice a different brand of management from that practiced by men. Whereas this may amount to good news in some quarters, we ought not to be prematurely elated by discovering that women manage just the way men do. Carolyn Sherif has pointedly called attention to the fact that all is not necessarily well in today's male-oriented management activities.[33]

In every comparison of male and female managers, in material sources ranging from anecdotal, individual accounts to the most rigorous matched-sample research, similarities abound.[34] Repeatedly, managerial success is seen not to be gender-dependent. Many of the differences between male and female managers are slight ones, which may fade further as the participation of women in the management of the labor force increases.

NOTES

[1]Hennig and Jardim, *The Managerial Woman;* Crawford, *Women in Middle Management;* Johnson, "Women: Born to Manage"; Gordon and Strober, "Initial Observations on a Pioneer Cohort: 1974 Women MBAs"; Wood and Greenfield, "Women Managers and Fear of Success"; Schein, "Fair Employment of Women Through Personnel Research"; Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport, *Sex, Career and Family;* "100 Top Corporate Women," *Business Week;* Robertson, "The Top Women in Big Business."

[2]Heidrick and Struggles, *Profile of a Woman Officer,* p. 1. Also see *Profile of a Woman Officer* for 1978 and 1977.

[3]Van Der Merwe, "A Portrait of the Canadian Woman Manager." Quote, p. 49.

[4]Halcomb, *Women Making It;* Adams, *Women on Top.*

[5]Lyle and Ross, *Women in Industry,* Chapter 4.

[6]Figures are U.S. Census and Current Population Survey data which covers companies of all sizes. Shaeffer and Lynton, *Corporate Experiences in Improving Women's Job Opportunities,* Appendix A, includes these figures in an interesting table that compares the percent of female managers in different industry groups by using sets of employment statistics, from the Census, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and a Conference Board survey.

[7]Ritchie and Boehm, "Biographical Data as a Predictor of Women's and Men's Management Potential."

[8]Larwood and Wood, *Women in Management,* pp. 96-101; Brief and Oliver, "Male-Female Differences in Work Attitudes."

[9]Adams, *Women on Top,* p. 192; Gordon and Strober, "Initial Observations on a Pioneer Cohort: 1974 Women MBAs."

[10]Miner, "The Real Crunch in Managerial Manpower"; Miner, "Motivation to Manage Among Women: Studies of Business Managers and Educational Administrators."

[11]Knotts, "Manifest Needs of Professional Female Workers in Business-Related Occupations." Also see Moore, "Distinguishing Characteristics of Women Managers."

[12]Baron, "Women in Management: A New Look," pp. 52-54.

[13]Mai-Dalton, "The Influence of Coworker Support and Stress on the Behavior and Perceived Performance of Male and Female Executives."

[14]Hennig and Jardim, *The Managerial Woman;* Crawford, *Women in Middle Management;* Johnson, "Women: Born to Manage"; Wood and Greenfeld, "Women Managers and Fear of Success"; Heidrick and Struggles, *Profile of a Woman Officer.*

[15]D.G. Winter, A.J. Stewart, and D.C. McClelland, "Husband's Motives and Wife's Career Level."

[16]Hennig and Jardim, *The Managerial Woman;* Crawford, *Women in Middle Management;* Johnson, "Women: Born to Manage"; Wood and Greenfeld, "Women Managers and Fear of Success."

[17]Halcomb, *Women Making It,* p. 181.

[18]Rice, *Dual-Career Marriage: Conflict and Treatment,* p. 15.

[19]Ferber, Huber and Spitze, "Preference for Men or Women Bosses or Professionals."

[20]Johnson, "Women: Born to Manage"; Hennig and Jardim, *The Managerial Woman;* Crawford, *Women in Middle Management;* Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport, *Women in Top Jobs: Four Studies in Achievement.*

[21]Gordon and Strober, "Initial Observations on a Pioneer Cohort: 1974 Women MBAs"; Schein, "Fair Employment of Women Through Personnel Research"; Hennig and Jardim, *The Managerial Woman;* Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport, *Women in Top Jobs;* Crawford, *Women in Middle Management;* Johnson, "Women: Born to Manage."

[22]Crawford, *Women in Middle Management;* Hennig and Jardim, *The Managerial Woman;* Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport, *Women in Top Jobs.*

[23]Morrison and Sebald, "Personal Characteristics Differentiating Female Executive from Female Nonexecutive Personnel." (Uses Canadian subjects.)

[24]Hennig and Jardim, *The Managerial Woman;* Crawford, *Women in Middle Management.*

[25]Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport, *Women in Top Jobs, p. 34.*

[16]*Ibid.*, p. 35.

[17]Harlan and Weiss, *Moving Up: Women in Managerial Careers.* Quote, p. 45.

[18]*Ibid.*, pp. 45-46.

[19]*Ibid.*, p. 51.

[20]Humphreys and Schrode, "Decision-Making Profiles of Female and Male Managers."

[21]Donnell and Hall, "Men and Women Managers: A Significant Case of No Significant Difference."

[22]*Ibid.*, p. 71.

[23]*Ibid.*, p. 76. Carolyn Sherif's comments are in *Women in Management*, ed. Gerrard, Oliver and Williams.

[24]For a comparison of the value systems of male and female managers, see Hodgetts, Pryor, Mills and Brinkman, "A Profile of the Successful Female."

SECTION IX

Lifestyles of Contemporary Female Managers: The Dual-Career Couple

> . . . many people [believe] the two most important things in their lives [are] loving and working. Can people have both? . . . We are finding . . . that preoccupation with career success can lead to personal and family failure. We are finally realizing that our task is to attain both career success and family success.[1]

So begins a new book by Francine and Douglass Hall on how to manage the problems and opportunities of an emergent lifestyle: the dual-career couple. The recent interest in careers of women in business has led to a concern with the personal dimension of the lives of executive women: their interpersonal relationships, their marriages, and their families. Research in this area has resulted in a relatively new concept: the "two-person career couple." Butler and Paisley distinguish this pattern from other love/work combinations: "A couple in which both partners work outside the home may be referred to as a dual-*job*-couple. If both partners are committed to the continuity of their work — that is, if the work is important for personal development as well as for household income — then we may say that they are a dual-*career*-couple."[2] Hall and Hall add: " . . . two-career couples are also defined by their life-style, a life style designed to support, encourage, and facilitate — not just tolerate — the career pursuits of both members."[3]

Although a relatively recent historical development, this phenomenon of dual-career marriage is increasingly common. There are an estimated three million dual-career families in the United States. (This is 1978 data, with wife between ages 25 and 54 and employed in a professional, technical, managerial, or administrative position.)[4] The growth in the number of marital relationships in which both partners have a serious and enduring commitment to their individual careers reflects several contemporary social changes: the influx of women into the labor market in general, increased interest of women in professional and managerial careers, and an apparent reversal of earlier tendencies for professional women to choose an unmarried personal life-style.

Women's perception of themselves and of their relationship to family and career have changed as well. At one time, the prescribed behavior was what Papanek has termed the "two-person career couple," a family structure in which women adapted their lives to facilitate their husbands' careers.[5] They received no formal acknowledgement for their efforts; they were honored by how successful their *husbands* were. Women are currently

finding that professional careers afford them a high degree of personal satisfaction, and they too are making the prerequisite commitments of time, energy, education, and self-identification. The decision to have a family does not mean an end to the careers of those women who have opted for a managerial track. It does require, however, a new mode of cooperation, flexibility, and understanding between marital partners. As Shaevitz and Shaevitz describe the dual-career relationship: "'a symphony with two conductors.' The potential for truly great music is there, but it takes exceptional measures of cooperation and teamwork to produce it."[6]

In their summary of research on the dual-career couple, Rhona and Robert Rapoport describe three stages in the history of the literature.[7] The first stage, the precursor studies of the 1960s, focused on the changes going on in sex roles. This generation of studies

> contributed to the formulation of the concept of dual-career families partly through their omissions — of concepts to comprehend *linkages* between men's and women's roles, between parents' and children's roles, between work and family roles. They made it clear that such a formulation was needed.

In the second stage, the "pivotal generation," researchers analyzed dual-career families as a structural type. During the early part of this period, the Rapoports published their now famous study, *Dual-Career Families.*[8] This volume was part of a British project to identify the factors motivating and/or constraining women from working in positions commensurate with their abilities. Developing concepts still used in the current advice literature, the researchers of this period conceptualized the stresses typical of this family organization:

> These concepts include *dilemmas,* overload, normative, cycling, network, and identity; *conflicts* between earlier and later norms, home and work expectations, ideals and feelings; *barriers,* domestic isolation, sex role prejudices and stereotypes; and *problems* such as the wife finding an appropriate job, . . . keeping personal aspirations within limits the marriage can tolerate, and arranging domestic help and childcare services.[9]

The third, or current, generation of investigations of dual-careerism has more diversity in methods and objectives. The different orientations reflect the emergence of specialized interests: policy, counseling, academic, feminist, therapeutic. The Rapoports own work indicates a change in attitude from the second to the third generation. *Dual-Career Families* was published in 1971, but by 1978 the Rapoports had edited a new book entitled *Working Couples.* This change in emphasis from the family to the couple reflects a shift in current thinking on the subject due to changes in both social patterns and social consciousness. More young women in management are marrying: therefore, there are more working managerial couples. At the same time, there is a greater acceptance of the possibility that a cou-

ple may choose not to have children, or to have them later in life. The treatment of a *couple* rather than the *family* as the unit to be studied creates a situation in which children are not viewed in the advice literature as part of the central picture, but rather as a problem to be dealt with. Future research on this subject will have to examine the effects of such a perspective on couples' decisions about whether or not to have children and on the process of childrearing in such families.

This third generation of writing and thinking about dual-career couples is characterized by a concentration on the strains put on the marital relationship and on the management of these stresses.[10] For example, C. Handy describes the male bias, the occupational system's regidities, and the heavy demands of the "greedy occupation" of management which make the working-couple's option an infrequent one among families of British middle managers.[11] Focusing on a different aspect of the problem, L. Bailyn considers the dynamics of accommodation that must occur in the relation between work and home life if the interdependence is to be successful for working couples. Bailyn's article is useful in suggesting a number of patterns of accommodation, but she does not suggest any mechanistic rules. She believes that a long-term perspective is important because the needs of couples change as they move through the life-cycle.[12]

Since the current research emphasizes stresses and their solutions, it is not at all surprising that a large proportion of the recent publications on this subject are psychologically-oriented advice and self-help books written by therapists using case-histories of dual-career couples they have counseled. The trend for dual-career couples to seek psychological help is in accord with the fact that within the population, in general, those most likely to seek such advice are often well-educated, earn high incomes, and accept professional expertise in many areas of life. However, one wonders what distortions may occur in the advice books' view of this life-style when the guidelines originate in the course of treating people who are having difficulties in their marriage. The situation may be analogous to that of the pre-feminist period in psychiatry when the limiting profile of what supposedly constituted a mentally healthy woman was drawn from the treatment of dysfunctional women mental patients.

There are a number of well-written books in this genre that comment especially on the kind of problems and possibilities a woman manager might encounter in a dual-career relationship. Among the best are M.H. Shaevitz and M.H. Shaevitz, *Making It Together as a Two-Career Couple;* D.G. Rice, *Dual-Career Marriage: Conflict and Treatment;* W.M. Jones and R.A. Jones, *Two Careers, One Marriage;* and F.S. Hall and D.T. Hall, *The Two-Career Couple.*

Identifying the "predictable issues and problems that are inherent in this kind of relationship," Shaevitz's *Making It Together* considers the assignments of household tasks, two-career parenting, the "other-than-mother dilemma," the control of money, and coping with overload. A particularly useful chapter discusses how to choose the "right" employer and

what factors to watch for in an employer which will be advantageous to a working couple.[13]

D.G. Rice's *Dual-Career Marriage: Conflict and Treatment* is written by a psychiatrist and is aimed at other professional therapists "to fill the clinical knowledge gap regarding the functioning of such couples." However, the volume is also of use to women managers in understanding the psychological origins of some of the day-to-day personal situations in which they live. Rice explains the personality characteristics typical of spouses who adopt a dual-career life-style: "(a) need for achievement, (b) strong narcissistic and/or self-esteem enhancement needs, and (c) difficulties in forming a sustained interpersonal commitment." The dynamics of this personality pattern often lead to three common problems: "(a) competition between spouses, (b) distribution of power in the marital relationship, and (c) arranging and maintaining a support structure." For dual-career marriages requiring therapeutic intervention, the final section of the book might be helpful in suggesting what kind of treatment techniques to seek and what to expect from such therapy.[14]

The authors of Jones' *Two Careers, One Marriage* use their experience as family counselors to comment on the problems faced by working couples "at that point at which their professional ambitions impinge on their plans for private existence." This volume is not quite as substantial as the others; much of the material is anecdotal, and the problem-solving techniques are not fully explicated. However, the discussion of psychosexual problems is interesting, e.g., the effects of separate working patterns which schedules creating different needs at different times.[15]

The Two-Career Couple by F.S. Hall and D.T. Hall is an excellent overview of the subject, including case histories and summaries of other researchers' work. The Halls first examine the background of the social changes influencing the "new style" couple relationship, e.g., a shift from a work ethic to a worth ethic. They can describe specific areas of conflict and suggest skills couples can use to minimize or resolve such stresses (e.g., making the house work, power in the home, and living apart).[16]

These books, as well as others in this genre cited in this section, provide important insights into the personal dimension of the lives of executive women. While presenting their findings, the researchers are operating on certain assumptions that represent significant attitudinal changes. First and foremost is the researchers' acceptance of the legitimacy of women's interest in and pursuit of professional and managerial careers. The authors are positively disposed toward the dual-career pattern and emphasize ways to deal with difficulties that arise. The question is no longer whether married women *should* seek a serious career, but *how* they can cope when they do so. Second, and equally important, is a new tendency to view women more holistically. These researchers assume that a committed work life for women today does not at all imply a disinterest or inability to sustain a satisfying personal or family life.

NOTES

Note: Recognizing the need for more pragmatic information on the two-career family and its effect on women, men, and their corporate employers, Catalyst (14 East 60th Street, New York, New York) recently established a Career and Family Center. This Center, funded by a major grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, will be a clearinghouse and a generator of research on a range of two-career family issues, including relocation, child care, and productivity. A bibliography of materials covering related topics such as corporate practices and policies is available for $10.00 from Catalyst: *Two-Career Families: A Bibliography of Relevant Readings* (New York: Catalyst, March 1980).

[1]Hall and Hall, *The Two-Career Couple*, p. v.

[2]Butler and Paisley, "Coordinated-Career Couples: Convergence and Divergence," p. 207. For another description, see Greiff and Munter, *Tradeoffs: Executive, Family and Organizational Life*, p. 38.

[3]Hall and Hall, *The Two-Career Couple*, p. 10.

[4]Rice, *Dual-Career Marriage: Conflict and Treatment*, p. 6.

[5]Papanek, "Men, Women, and Work: Reflections on the Two-Person Career."

[6]Shaevitz and Shaevitz, *Making It Together as a Two-Career Couple*, p. x.

[7]Rapoport and Rapoport, "Three Generations of Dual-Career Family Research."

[8]Rapoport and Rapoport, *Dual Career Families*.

[9]Rapoport and Rapoport, "Three Generations of Dual-Career Family Research."

[10]*Ibid.*, p. 34.

[11]Handy, "Going Against the Grain: Working Couples and Greedy Occupations."

[12]Bailyn, "Accommodation of Work to Family."

[13]Shaevitz and Shaevitz, *Making It Together*.

[14]Rice, *Dual-Career Marriage: Conflict and Treatment*. Quotes, pp. 34 and 65.

[15]Jones and Jones, *Two Careers — One Marriage*. Quote, p. vi.

[16]Hall and Hall, *The Two-Career Couple*.

RESEARCH NOTE

In order to facilitate future research and avoid duplicate effort, a listing of the sources used for the *initial* information search might be of use to others who want to review other titles and sources.

Electronic searches were done in the following collections of the Lockhead DIALOG data base system:

File 75: Management Contents; November 1979.
Covered 1974-September 1979.

File 11: Psychological Abstracts; November 1979.
Covered 1967-September 1979.

File 37: Sociological Abstracts; November 1979.
Covered 1963-October 1979.

File 38: History and Life; March 1980.
Covered 1963-1978.

The following terms were cross referenced to locate titles:

File 75 (Management Contents): Women in Business; Management; Manager; Executive; Women.

File 11 (Psychological Abstracts): Human Females; Women; Woman; Management; Managers; Executive; Business.

File 37 (Sociological Abstracts): Women; Woman; Female; Manage; Executive; Business; Manager.

File 38 (History and Life): Females; Female; Woman; Women; Manager; Executive; Entrpreneur; Women and Business.

Additional book titles were also identified in searches in:
SCORPIO-LC: November 1979. Covered 1978 and 1979.
LIBCON (Orbit IV). December 1978. Covered in 1973-1978.

Manual Searches for 1980 material were done in *Psychological Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, Business Periodicals Index,* and in publishers' listings of new and forthcoming books.

The bibliography which follows lists the items reviewed and analyzed in the preceding Sections of this book.

80

References

Adams, J., *Women on Top*. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1979.

Adler, Nancy J., "Women as Androgynous Managers: A Conceptualization of the Potential for American Women in International Management," *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 3, no. 4 (1979), 407-36.

Ahrons, C.R., "Counselor's Perceptions of Career Images of Women," *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 8, no. 2 (April 1976), 197-207.

Almquist, E.M., "Sex Stereotypes in Occupational Choice: The Case for College Women," *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 5, no. 1 (August 1974), 13-21.

Almquist, E.M. and S.S. Angrist, "Role Model Influences on College Women's Career Aspirations," in *The Professional Woman*, ed., A. Theodore. Cambridge: Schenkman, 1971.

"AMBA-Zehnder MBA Survey Charts International Career and Salary Trends," *MBA Executive* (September 1979), pp. 3, 6, 13-15.

Anderson, K., *Wartime Women: Sex Roles, Family Relations, and the Status of Women During World War II*. Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press, 1981.

Astin, A.W., M.R. King and G.T. Richardson, *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1979*. Cooperative Institutional Research Program of the American Council on Education and UCLA Graduate School of Education, 1979.

Badavas, C., W. Baker, J. Dawson, G. Gorman and C. Kreter, "An Analysis of the Starting Salaries for Tuck MBA's for the Years 1977-78." Unpublished mimeo, The Amos Tuck School, Dartmouth College, 1978.

Badawy, M.K., "How Women Manager View Their Role in the Organization," *Personnel Administrator* 23, no. 2 (1978), 60-68.

Bailyn, L., "Accommodation of Work to Family," in *Working Couples*, ed.,R. Rapoport and R.N. Rapoport. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Banfield, E., "Women in Middle Management Positions." Ph.D. dissertation, United States International University, 1976.

Barmash, I., "Women Recommended as Potential Directors," *New York Times* (March 6, 1979), IV, p. 4.

Barnhill-Hayes, *Employer Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action*. Milwaukee, Wis.: Barnhill-Hayes, 1979.

Baron, A.S., "Selection, Development and Socialization of Women Into Management," *Business Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (1977), 61-67.

_____ "Women in Management: A New Look," *The Personnel Administrator* (December 1978), pp. 52-54.

Barrett, N.S., "Women in the Job Market," in *The Subtle Revolution: Women at Work*, ed., R.E. Smith, Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1979.

Bartol, K.M., "The Sex Structuring of Organizations: A Search for Possible Causes," *Academy of Management Review* 3, no. 4 (October 1978), 805-815.

Bartol, K.M. and D.A. Butterfield, "Sex Effects in Evaluating Leaders," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 61 (1976), 446-454.

Basil, D.C., *Women in Management*. New York: Dunellen, 1972.

Bedeian, A.G., A.A. Aremenakis and B.W. Kemp, "Relation of Sex to Perceived Legitimacy of Organizational Influence," *The Journal of Psychology* 94 (1976), 93-99.

Bigoness, W.J., "Effect of Applicant's Sex, Race, and Performance on Employer's Performance Ratings: Some Additional Findings," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 61 (1976), 80-84.

Biles, G.E. and H. Pryatel, "Myths, Management and Women," *Personnel Journal*, (October 1978), pp. 572-577.

Bird, C., *Enterprising Women*. New York: Norton, 1976.
Blitz, R., "Women in the Professions," *Monthly Labor Review* 97, no. 5 (1974), pp. 34-39.
Booz, Allen and Hamilton, "Corporate Board Trends with Respect to Directors — Particularly Women." New York: Booz, Allen and Hamilton, April 14, 1977.
Bowman, G.W., N.B. Worthy, and S.A. Greyson, "Problem in Review: Are Women Executives People?" *Harvard Business Review* 43, no. 4 (1965), 14-28, 164-178.
Brief, A.P. and R.L. Oliver, "Male-Female Differences in Work Attitudes Among Retail Sales Managers," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 61 (1976), 526-528.
Brito, P.K. and C.L. Jusenius, "Occupational Expectations for Age 35," in U.S. Department of Labor, *Years for Decision*, Vol. 4, R & D Monograph No. 24, 1978.
Burrow, M.G., *Developing Women Managers: What Needs to be Done?* New York: AMACOM, 1978.
Business and Profesional Women's Foundation, *Women Executives: A Selected Annotated Bibliography*. Washington, D.C.: BPW Foundation, 1970.
_____ *Women in Management*. Washington, D.C.: BPW Foundation, 1979.
_____ "Women in an Employment Network." Research in progress, BPW, Washington, D.C.
Butler, M. and W. Paisley, "Coordinated-Career Couples: Convergence and Divergence," in *Dual-Career Couples*, ed., F. Pepitone-Rockwell. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Pub., 1980.
Butler, P.E., *Self-Assertion for Women, A Guide to Becoming Androgynous*. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.
Buzenberg, M., "Women's Career-Femininity-Marriage," in *Woman and Management: An Expanding Role*, ed., D. Jewell. Atlanta: School of Business Administration, Georgia State University, 1977.
Cannie, J.K., *The Woman's Guide to Management Success: How to Win Power in the Real Organizational World*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1979.
Cecil, E.A., R.A. Olins and R.J. Paul, "Perceived Importance of Selected Variables Used to Evaluate Male and Female Job Applicants," *Personnel Psychology* 26 (1973), 397-404.
Chapman, J.B., "Comparisons of Male and Female Leadership Style," *Academy of Management Journal* 18 (1975), 645-650.
Churchill, N.C., "Analyzing and Modeling Human Resource Flows," in *Monitoring the Human Resource System*, ed., R.G. Shaeffer. New York: The Conference Board, 1977.
Cohen, S.L. and K.A. Bunker, "Subtle Effects of Sex-Role Stereotypes on Recruiter's Hiring Decisions," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60 (1975), 566-572.
Cohen, S.L. and S. Leavengood, "The Utility of the WAMS: Shouldn't it Relate to Discriminatory Behaviour?" *Academy of Management Journal* 21, no. 4 (December 1978), 742-748.
Collins, G.C. and P. Scott, eds., "Everyone Who Makes it Has a Mentor," *Harvard Business Review* 56, no. 4 (1979), 89-101.
Crawford, J.S., *Women in Middle Management: Selection, Training, Advancement, Performance*. Ridgewood, N.J.: Forkner Pub., 1977.
Daniels, A.K., "Development of Feminist Networks in the Professions," *Annals New York Academy of Sciences* (1979), pp. 215-227.
Day, D.R. and R.M. Stogdill, "Leader Behavior of Male and Female Supervisors: A Comparative Study," *Personnel Psychology* 25 (1972), 353-360.
Deaux, K. and J. Taynor, "Evaluation of Male and Female Ability: Bias Works Two Ways," *Psychological Reports* 32 (1973), 261-262.
Dexter, E., *Colonial Women of Affairs*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1931.
_____, *Career Women of America, 1776-1840*. Francestown, N.H.: M. Jones Co., 1950.
Dipboye, R.L., "Women as Managers — Stereotypes and Realities," in *Women in Management*, ed., B.A. Stead. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978.
Dipboye, R.L., H.L. Franklin, and K. Wiback, "Relative Importance of Applicant Sex, Attractiveness, and Scholastic Standing in Evaluation of Job Applicant Resumes," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60 (1975), 39-45.
Donnell, S.M. and J. Hall, "Men and Women Managers: A Significant Case of No Significant Difference," *Organizational Dynamics*, (Spring 1980), pp. 60-77.

Doudna, C. and C. Rupp, "Up the Masthead: The Push for Power in the Press," *Savvy* (September 1980), pp. 24-32.
Endicott, F., *The Endicott Report 1978*. Evanston, Ill.: The Placement Center/Northwestern University, 1977.
Epstein, C.F., *Woman's Place: Options and Limits in Professional Careers*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.
_____ "Institutional Barriers: What Keeps Women Out of the Executive Suite?" in *Bringing Women into Management*, ed., F. Gordon and M. Strober. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1975.
"Executive Suite: Finding Directorships for Women," *Business Week* (March 12 1979), p. 28.
Executive Woman [Bi-Monthly Newsletter]. National Association for Female Executives, 134 East 38th Street, New York, New York.
Farah, C., "The Importance of Support Systems for Male and Female Managers." Ph.D. dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, 1980.
Farley, J., *Affirmative Action and the Woman Worker: Guidelines for Personnel Management*. New York: AMACOM, 1979.
Fenn, M., *Making It In Management: A Behavioral Approach for Women Executives*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1979.
Ferber, M., J. Huber and G. Spitze, "Preference for Men as Bosses and Professionals," *Social Forces* 58 (December 1979), 466-476.
Ferrari, S., "The Italian Woman Executive," *Management International Review* 17 (1977), 13-21.
Fogarty, M.P., I. Allen and P. Walters, *Women in Top Jobs 1968-78*. London: Heinemann, 1981.
Fogarty, M.P., R. Rapoport and R.N. Rapoport, *Sex, Career and Family*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1971.
_____ *Women in Top Jobs: Four Studies in Achievement*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971.
Fottler, M.D. and T. Bain, "Sex Differences in Occupational Aspirations," *Academy of Management Journal* 23, no. 1 (1980), 144-149.
Fox, E.H., "Business School Survey: Women Outpace Men in Enrollments," *Enterprising Women* (November 1977), pp. 3, 6.
Foxworth, J., *Boss Lady: An Executive Woman Talks About Making It*. New York: Crowell, 1978.
_____ *Wising Up: The Mistakes Women Make in Business and How To Avoid Them*. New York: Delacorte Press, 1980.
Fragner, B.N., "Affirmative Action Through Hiring and Promotion: How Fast a Rate?" *Personnel* (November-December 1979), pp. 67-71.
Frank, H., *Women in the Organization*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
Fukami, C., "The Effects of Socialization and Sex Roles on Changes in Attitudes Toward Women Managers," *Academy of Management Proceedings* (1977), pp. 276-280.
Garland, H. and K.H. Price, "Attitudes Toward Women in Management and Attributions for Their Success and Failure in Managerial Positions," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 62 (1977), 29-33.
Gerrard, M., J. Oliver and M. Williams, eds., *Women in Management*. Austin: School of Social Work, University of Texas, 1976.
Ginzberg, E. and A. Yohalem, eds., *Corporate Lib: Women's Challenge to Management*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
Gold, A.R., "Reexamining Barriers to Women's Career Development," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 48 (October 1978), 690-702.
Goode, W., "Family Life of the Successful Woman," in *Corporate Lib: Women's Challenge to Management*, ed., E. Ginzberg and A. Yohalem. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.
Gordon, F. and M. Strober, eds., *Bringing Women into Management*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.

_____ "Initial Observations on a Pioneer Cohort: 1974 Women MBAs," *Sloan Management Review* 19, no. 2 (Winter 1978), 15-23.

Gornick, V. and B. Moran, eds., *Woman in Sexist Society: Studies in Power and Powerlessness*. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Greenwood, R.G., "Lillian M. Gilbreth, First Lady of Management," *Academy of Management Proceedings* (1978), pp. 2-6.

Greiff, B.S. and P.K. Munter, *Tradeoffs: Executive, Family and Organizational Life*. New York: New American Library, 1980.

Hackamack, L.E. and A.B. Solid, "The Woman Executive," *Business Horizons* (April 1972), pp. 89-93.

Haemmerli, A., "Women in International Business." Paper prepared for Women in International Business, sponsored by Chase World Information Corporation, New York, New York, July 11, 1978.

Hagen, R. and A. Kahn, "Discrimination Against Competent Women," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 5, no. 4 (1975), 362-376.

Haist, D., *Women in Management: A Selected Bibliography*. Ontario: Ministry of Labour, 1976.

Halcomb, R., *Women Making It*. New York: Atheneum, 1979.

Hall, F.S. and D.T. Hall, *The Two-Career Couple*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub., 1979.

Hamner, W.E., J.S. Kim, L. Baird and W.J. Bigoness, "Race and Sex as Determinants of Ratings by Potential Employers in a Simulated Work-Sampling Task," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 59 (1974), 705-711.

Handy, C., "Going Against the Grain: Working Couples and Greedy Occupations," in *Working Couples*, eds., R. Rapoport and R.N. Raport. New York: Harper and Row, 1978.

Harlan, A., *A Comparison of Careers for Male and Female MBAs*. Working Paper, 1978, Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

Harlan, A. and M. Jelinek, "Women in Management: A Study of the Graduates of Harvard Business School." Paper presented at the National Meetings of the Academy of Management, Kansas City, Missouri, 1976.

Harlan, A. and C. Weiss, *Moving Up: Women in Managerial Careers*. Third Progress Report, 1980. Center for Research on Women, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

Harragan, B.L., *Games Mother Never Taught You: Corporate Gamesmanship for Women*. New York: Rawson Associates, 1977.

Hart, L.B., *Moving Up! Women and Leadership*. New York: AMACOM, 1980.

Hartman, S.M., "Prescriptions for Penelope: Literature on Women's Obligations to Returning WWII Veterans," *Women's Studies* 5 (1978), 223-239.

Heidrick and Struggles, Inc., *Profile of a Woman Officer*. New York: Heidrick and Struggles, 1977, 1978, 1979.

Hennig, M. and A. Jardim, *The Managerial Woman*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1977.

Herbert, T.T. and E.B. Yost, "Faking Study of Scores on the Women as Managers Scale," *Psychological Reports* 42 (April 1978), 677-678.

Higginson, M.V. and T.L. Quick, *The Ambitious Woman's Guide to a Successful Career*. New York: AMACOM, 1975.

Hobart, C. and K. Harries, "Sex-Role Stereotyping Among Future Managers," in *Women and Management: An Expanding Role*, ed., D. Jewell. Atlanta: School of Business Administration, Georgia State University, 1977.

Hodgetts, R.M., M. Pryor, H.N. Mills and K. Brinkman, "A Profile of the Successful Female," *Academy of Management Proceedings* (1978), pp. 374-378.

Houston, L., "Businesswomanly Wiles: A Few Rules on Disarming the Skeptics," *MBA: Master in Business Administration* 11, no. 8 (1977), 30-31.

"How Men Adjust to a Female Boss," *Business Week* (September 5, 1977), pp. 90-94.

Humphreys, L.W. and W.A. Schrode, "Decision-Making Profiles of Female and Male Managers," *MSU Business Topics* 26, no. 4 (Autumn 1978), 45-51.

Ilgen, D.R. and J.R. Terborg, "Sex Discrimination and Sex-role Stereotypes: Are They Synonomous? No!" *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 14 (1975), 154-157.

Janeway, E., "Family Life in Transition," in *Corporate Lib: Women's Challenge to Management*, eds. E. Ginzberg and A. Yohalem. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Janger, A.R., *The Personnel Function: Changing Objectives and Organization*. New York: The Conference Board, 1977.

Jewell, D., ed., *Women and Management: An Expanding Role*. Atlanta: School of Business Administration, Georgia State University, 1977.

Johnson, C., *America's First Lady Boss*. Norwalk, Conn.: Silvermine Pub., 1965.

Johnson, M.L., "Women: Born to Manage," *Industry Week* (August 4, 1975), pp. 22-26.

Jones, W. and R.A. Jones, *Two Careers — One Marriage*. New York: AMACOM, 1980.

Jordan, J.P., "Women Merchants in Colonial New York," *New York History* 58, no. 4 (1977), 412-439.

Josefowitz, N., *Paths to Power: A Woman's Guide From First Job to Top Executive*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1980.

Joselow, F., "Salary Survey 1980," *Working Woman* (February 1980), pp. 31-35, 80.

Kagan, J., "How Management Myths Hurt Women," *Working Woman* (December 1980), pp. 75-78.

Kanter, R.M., *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Kaplan, D.L. and M.C. Casey, *Occupational Trends in the United States: 1900-1950*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce, 1958.

Kleiman, C., *Women's Networks: The Complete Guide to Getting a Better Job, Advancing Your Career, and Feeling Great as a Woman Through Networking*. New York: Lippincott and Crowell, 1980.

Klemesrud, J., "Women Executives: View from the Top," *New York Times* (March 11, 1979), p. 50.

Knotts, R., "Manifest Needs of Professional Female Workers in Business-Related Occupations," *Journal of Busines Research* 3 (July 1975), 267-277.

Korn/Ferry International, *Board of Directors Annual Study. (First-Seventh)*. New York: Korn/Ferry, 1973-1979.

Lannon, J., "Male and Female Values in Management [United Kingdom]," *Management International Review* 17 (1977), 9-12.

Larwood, L. and M. Wood, *Women in Management*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1977.

Lawrence, K., ed., *Sex Discrimination in the Workplace*. Germantown, Md.: Aspen Systems Corporation, 1978.

Lekachman, "On Economic Equality," *Signs* 1, no. 1 (Autumn 1975), 93-102.

Levitin, T.E., R.P. Quinn and G.L. Staines, "Sex Discrimination Against the American Working Woman," *American Behavioral Scientist* 15 (1971), 237-254.

Lipman-Blumen, J., "A Model of Direct and Relational Achieving Styles," in *Achievement Motivation: Recent Trends in Theory and Research*, ed., L.J. Fyans. New York: Plenum Press, 1980.

Lipman-Blumen, J. and H.J. Leavitt, "A Case for the Relational Manager," *Organizational Dynamics* (summer 1980), pp. 27-41.

Loring, R. and T. Wells, *Breakthrough: Women into Management*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1972.

Lutterman, K.G. and Associates, eds., *Discrimination in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979.

Lyle, J.R. and J.L. Ross, *Women in Industry: Employment Patterns of Women in Corporate America*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1973.

Lynch, E., *The Executive Suite — Feminine Style*. New York: AMACOM, 1973.

McCuen, B.A., "Psychological Attributes of Male and Female Students in a Collegiate Business School Potentially Affecting Their Relative Advancment to Managerial Positions." Ph.D. dissertation, Iowa State University, 1977.

McLane, H.J., *Selecting, Developing and Retaining Women Executives: A Corporate Strategy for the Eighties*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1980.
Mai-Dalton, R.R., "The Influence of Co-worker Support and Stress on the Behavior and Perceived Performance of Male and Female Executives." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1978.
Mainiero, L.A., G.N. Powell and D.A. Butterfield, "Sex Role Identity: A Predictor of Managerial Aspirations," forthcoming.
Martin, C.R., "Support for Women's Lib: Management Performance," *Southern Journal of Business* (February 1972), pp. 17-28.
Massengill, D. and N. Di Marco, "Sex-role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics: A Current Replication," *Sex Roles* 5 (1979), 561-570.
Maule, F., *Executive Careers for Women*. New York: Harper, 1957.
Merkin, A., "Choosing a Mentor," *Women's Work* (November/December 1977), pp. 12-15.
Miner, J.B., "The Real Crunch in Managerial Manpower," *Harvard Business Review* 51, no. 6 (1973), 146-158.
_____ *The Human Constraint*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Affairs, 1974.
_____ "Motivation to Manage Among Women: Studies of Business Managers and Educational Administrators," *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 5, no. 2 (October 1974), 197-208.
_____ "Motivation to Manage Among Women: Studies of College Students," *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 5, no. 2 (October 1974), 241-250.
Moore, L.M., "Distinguishing Characteristics of Women Managers." Ph.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1977.
Morrison, R.F. and M.L. Sebald, "Personal Characteristics Differentiating Female Executives from Female Nonexecutive Personnel," [uses Canadian subjects]. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 59, no. 5 (1974), 656-659.
Much, M., "Managing the Board," *Industry Week* (June 9, 1980), pp. 53-58.
Neu, I.D., "The Jewish Businesswomen in America," *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* (September 1976), pp. 137-154.
Norgaard, C.T., "Problems and Perspectives of Female Managers," *MSU Business Topics* 28, no. 1 (Winter 1980), 23-28.
Northrup, H.R. and J.A. Larson, *The Impact of the AT&T-EEO Consent Decree*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, The Wharton School, 1979.
O'Leary, V.E., "Some Attitudinal Barriers to Occupational Aspirations in Women," *Psychological Bulletin* 81 (1974), 809-828.
"100 Top Corporate Women," *Business Week* (June 21, 1976), pp. 56-60, 65-68.
Oppenheimer, V.K., *The Female Labor Force in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
Osborn, R.N. and W.M. Vicars, "Sex Stereotypes: An Artifact in Leader Behavior and Subordinate Satisfaction Analysis," *Academy of Management Journal* 19 (September 1976), 439-449.
"Out of the Typing Pool and Onto the Board: A List of Women Directors," *Business and Society Review* (Summer 1977), pp. 27-33.
"An Overview of Women in the Workforce," *INFORM* 7, no. 2 (September 1978).
Papanek, H., "Men, Women, and Work: Reflections on the Two-Person Career," *American Journal of Sociology* 78, no. 4 (1973), 852-872.
Parker, S., "The Yin and the Yang: Do Women Managers Have the Best of Both Worlds? A Comparative Study of the Masculinity and Femininity of Managers." Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University, 1976.
Patton, A., "The Coming Scramble for Executive Talent," *Harvard Business Review* 45, no. 3 (1967), 155.
Pepitone-Rockwell, F., ed., *Dual-Career Couples*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Pub., 1980.
Peters, L.H., J.R. Terborg, and J. Taynor, "Women as Managers Scale (WAMS): A Measure of Attitudes Toward Women in Management Positions," *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, Ms. no. 585, (1974).
Phillips, L. ("Mentors and Proteges: A Study of the Career Development of Women Managers and Executives in Business and Industry." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California-Los Angeles, 1977.

Place, I.M. and A. Armstrong, *Management Careers for Women*. Skokie, Ill.: VGM Career Horizons, 1975.
Powell, G.N. and D.A. Butterfield, "The 'Good Manager': Masculine or Androgynous?" *Academy of Management Journal* 22, no. 2 (June 1979), 395-403.
Rapoport, R. and R.N. Rapoport, *Dual-Career Families*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1971.
_____ *Working Couples*. New York: Harper and Row, 1978.
_____ "Three Generations of Dual-Career Family Research," in *Dual-Career Couples*, ed., F. Pepitone-Rockwell. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Pub., 1980.
Rice, D.G., *Dual-Career Marriage: Conflict and Treatment*. New York: Free Press, 1979.
Ritchie, R.J. and V.R. Boehm, "Biographical Data As a Predictor of Women's and Men's Potential," *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 11, no. 3 (December 1977), 363-368.
Robertson, W., "The Top Women in Big Business," *Fortune* (July 17, 1978), pp. 58-63.
_____ "Women M.B.A.'s, Harvard '73," *Fortune* (August 28, 1978), pp. 50-60.
Roche, G.R., "Probing Opinions," *Harvard Business Review* 57, no. 1 (1979), 14-28.
Roper Organization, *The 1980 Virginia Slims American Women's Opinion Poll*. New York: Philip Morris, Inc., 1980.
Rosen, B. and T.H. Jerdee, "Effects of Applicant's Sex and Difficulty of Job on Evaluations of Candidates for Managerial Positions," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 59 (1974), 511-512.
_____ "Influence of Sex Role Stereotypes of Personnel Decisions," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 59 (1974), 9-14.
_____ "Sex Stereotyping in the Executive Suite," *Harvard Business Review* 52, no. 2 (1974), 45-58.
_____ "The Psychological Basis for Sex Role Stereotypes: A Note on Terborg and Ilgen's Conclusions," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 14 (1975), 151-153.
Rosenbaum, J.E., "Career Paths and Advancement Opportunities," in *Discrimination in Organizations*, eds., K.G. Lutterman and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979.
Safilios-Rothschild, C., "The Options of Greek Men and Women," *Sociological Focus* (1971-72), pp. 71-83.
Savvy [Monthly Magazine]. Savvy Company, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, New York.
Scharf, L., *To Work and To Wed: Female Employment, Feminism and the Great Depression*. Westpoint, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1980.
Schein, V.E., "Fair Employment of Women Through Personnel Research," *Personnel Journal* 51 (May 1972), 330-335.
_____ "The Relationship Between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 57 (April 1973), 95-100.
_____ "Relationships Between Sex Role Stereotypes and Requisite Management Characteristics Among Female Managers," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 60 (June 1975), 340-344.
Schermerhorn, J.R., A.L. Sneison, and G.C. Leader, "Women in Management: The MBA Students' Perspective," *Academy of Management Proceedings* (1975), pp. 451-453.
Schneider, S.A., *The Availability of Minorities and Women for Professional and Managerial Positions, 1970-1985*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1977.
Schneir, M., *'She Merchants' in Seventeenth Century Holland and New Netherland*. Preprint series, 1980, Center for the Social Sciences, Columbia University, New York, New York.
Schwartz, E.B., *The Sex Barrier in Business*. Atlanta: Georgia State University, 1971.
Schwartz, F.N., "New Work Patterns — For Better Use of Womanpower," *Management Review* (May 1974), 5-12.
Sekiguchi, R., "Social Location of the Graduate Women: A Comparative Study of Japan and West Germany on Their Occupations," *Japanese Sociological Review* (March 1973), pp. 83-100.
Schaeffer, R.G., *Staffing Systems: Managerial and Professional Jobs*. New York: The Conference Board, 1972.

_____ *Non-Discrimination in Employment, Changing Perspectives, 1963-1972*. New York: Conference Board, 1973.

_____ *Non-Discrimination in Employment, 1973-1975, A Broadening and Deepening National Effort*. New York: Conference Board, 1975.

_____, ed., *Monitoring the Human Resource System*. New York: Conference Board, 1977.

Shaeffer, R.G. and H. Axel, *Improving Job Opportunities: A Chartbook Focusing on the Progress in Business*. New York: Conference Board, 1978.

Shaeffer, R.G. and E.F. Lynton, *Corporate Experiences in Improving Women's Job Opportunities*. New York: Conference Board, 1979.

Shaevitz, M.H. and M.H. Shaevitz, *Making It Together as a Two-Career Couple*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1980.

Shapiro, E.C., F.P. Haseltine and M.P. Rowe, "Moving Up: Role Models, Mentors, and the 'Patron System'," *Sloan Management Review* 19, no. 3 (Spring 1978), 51-58.

Shaw, E.A., "Differential Impact of Negative Stereotyping in Employee Selection," *Personnel Psychology* 25 (1972), 333-338.

Shepherd, W.G. and S.G. Levin, "Managerial Discrimination in Large Firms," *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 55, no. 4 (1973), 412-422.

Smith, R.E., ed., *The Subtle Revolution: Women at Work*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1979.

Sommers, D., "Occupational Ranking for Men and Women by Earnings," *The Monthly Labor Review* (August 1974), pp. 34-35.

Speizer, J.J., *Role Models, Mentors, and Sponsors: The Elusive Concepts*. Working Paper, 1979, Higher Education Resource Services, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts. (Forthcoming in *Signs* 6, No. 4. Summer 1981).

Staines, G.L., R.P. Quinn and L.J. Shepard, "Trends in Occupational Sex Discrimination: 1969-1973," *Industrial Relations* 15 (1976), 88-98.

Stanford, S., "Attitudes Toward Women: Critical Background Predictions and the Effect of a Managerial Development and Feminist Awareness Seminar. Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1975.

Stead, B.A., ed., *Women in Management*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

_____ "Women's Contributions to Management Thought," in *Women in Management*, ed., B.A. Stead, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Steele, J. and L. Ward, "M.B.A.'s: Mobile, Well Situated, Well Paid," *Harvard Business Review* 52, no. 1 (1974), 99-110.

Stewart, N., *The Effective Woman Manager: Seven Vital Skills for Upward Mobility*. New York: John Wiley, 1978.

Stricker, F., "Cookbooks and Law Books: The Hidden History of Career Women in Twentieth Century America," *Journal of Social History* 10, no. 1 (1976), 1-19.

Stultz, J.E., "Madam Director," *Directors & Boards* 3, no. 4 (Winter 1979), 6-20.

Swanick, L., *Women as Administrators*. Public Administration Series, Monticello, Ill.: Vance Bibliographies, 1978.

Terborg, J., "Women in Management: A Research Review," *Journal of Applied Psychology* 62 (December 1977), 647-664.

Terborg, J.R., and D.R. Ilgen, "A Theoretical Approach to Sex Discrimination in Traditionally Masculine Occupations," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 13 (1975), 352-376.

Terborg, J., L. Peters, D.R. Ilgen and F. Smith, "Organizational and Personal Correlates of Attitudes Toward Women as Managers," *Academy of Management Journal* 20 (March 1977), 89-100.

Theodore, A., ed., *The Professional Woman*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1971.

Thompson, J., "Patrons, Rabbis, Mentors," *MBA: Master in Business Administration* 10, no. 2 (1976), 26-27+.

Tipton, R.M., "Attitudes Towards Women's Roles in Society and Vocational Interests," *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 8, no. 2 (April 1976), 155-165.

Treiman, D.J. and K. Terrell, "Sex and the Process of Status Attainment: A Comparison of

Working Women and Men," *American Sociological Review* 40 (1975), 174-200.
Two-Career Families: A Bibliography of Relevant Readings. New York: Catalyst, March 1980.
U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Money Income of Families and Persons in the United States: 1978*, Series P-60, no. 123 (June 1980).
_____ *A Statistical Portrait of Women in the United States: 1978*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980.
U.S. Department of Labor, *Women in Management: Selected Recent References*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.
U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Employment and Earnings* 7, no. 7 (January 1961).
_____ *Employment and Earnings* 17, no. 7 (January 1971).
_____ *Employment and Earnings* 26, no. 1 (January 1979).
_____ *Employment and Earnings* 27, no. 1 (January 1980).
_____ *Employment in Perspective: Working Women*, Report 600 (April 1980).
U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, "Table: Women Are Under-represented as Managers. . ." Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1978.
_____ *A Working Woman's Guide to Her Job Rights*, Leaflet 55. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.
_____ *The Earnings Gap Between Women and Men*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1979.
"Up the Ladder, Finally," *Business Week* (November 24, 1975), pp. 58-68.
Vaden, R.E. and N.B. Lynn, "The Administrative Person: Will Women Bring a Different Morality to Management?" *University of Michigan Business Review* 31, no. 2 (March 1979), 22-25.
VanDerMerwe, S., "A Portrait of the Canadian Woman Manager," *Business Quarterly* 43, no. 3 (Autumn 1978), 45-52.
_____ "Women as Managers: The Current Attitudes and Programs of Canadian Businessmen," *Business Quarterly* 44, no. 1 (Spring 1979), 35-39.
Willett, R., "Working in 'A Man's World': The Woman Executive," in *Woman in Sexist Society: Studies in Power and Powerlessness*, eds., V. Gornick and B. Moran. New York: Basic Books, 1971.
Williams, M., J. Oliver and M. Gerrard, *Women in Management: A Selected Bibliography*. Austin: Center for Social Work Research, University of Texas, 1977.
Williams, M.G., *The New Executive Woman*. Radnor, Pa.: Chilton Book Co., 1977.
Winter, D.G., A.J. Stewart and D.C. McClelland, "Husband's Motives and Wife's Career Level," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 35, no. 3 (1977), 159-166.
"Women Directors: How To Get on a Corporate Board," *Working Woman* (February 1980), p. 42.
"Women: Where the Management Jobs Are," *Personnel* 54, no. 6 (1977), 45-46.
Wood, M.M. and S.T. Greenfeld, "Women Managers and Fear of Success," *Sex Roles* 2 (1976), 375-387.
Woodworth, M. and W. Woodworth, "The Female Takeover: Threat or Opportunity," *The Personnel Administrator* (January 1979), pp. 19-24, 28.
Working Mother [Monthly magazine]. McCalls, 230 Park Avenue, New York, New York.
Working Woman [Monthly magazine]. Hal Publications, Inc., 1180 6th Avenue, New York, New York.
Zaleznik, A., "Managers and Leaders: Are They Different?" *Harvard Business Review* 55, no. 3 (1977), 67-78.